

E 701

H58

~~1891~~

Epoch of the Democratic
Party

PRICE, 25 CENTS.

POSITIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.



— BY —
W. P. HESS,
PEARL, ILL.

A
DISCUSSION
— OF THE —
Party's Position
— ON —
GOVERNMENTAL
POLICY.

Cents.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. Copyright No.

Shelf

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ECHOES

OF THE

DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

A DISCUSSION
OF THE PARTY'S POSITION ON
GOVERNMENTAL POLICY.

BY W. F. HESS,
PEARL, ILL.

Price, Twenty-Five Cents.

SOLD BY MONITOR PUBLISHING CO.,

ROOM 506, FAGIN BUILDING, ST. LOUIS, MO.

E 701
.H58

COPYRIGHT, 1891,
BY
W. F. HESS.

PREFACE.

The letters which appear as correspondence called for this publication. The author was surprised that persons, elected to the legislatures would make such declarations as the second letter of the gentleman's contains. One would suppose that men of this standing should at least possess intelligence enough to show that he thoroughly understands the position of *his political* party. If man is conscientious in his convictions of governmental policy (and wrong) he is partly justified in his position, but to make such declarations as are contained in the second letter written to the author, is in the face of facts an utter disregard of truth or exhibition of ignorance of the *dangerous type*.

Being surrounded with obstacles and daily toil in the district school, our attention could not be steadily applied to the objects of this work, and was only accomplished by burning mid oil, and if its pages lightens the burdens of toil or give rest to the weary tramp, or tend to correct one single evil of society, we will feel amply repaid.

W. F. HESS.

PEARL, ILL., Feb. 22, 1891.

J. M. HAMBAUGH'S FIRST LETTER AND
CIRCULAR.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., Jan. 19, 1891.

DEAR SIR: There will be an effort on the part of Chicago to secure a liberal and expensive appropriation from the legislature for the Columbian Exposition, I understand they have already a location in view, for the State exhibit, embracing near eight acres in area, and their diagrams and plans laid out will necessitate an appropriation of from \$750,000 to \$1,000,000, and in view of the fact that large appropriations will be necessary to increase the capacity of our penitentiaries, insane and other charitable institutions, what would be the limit of your vote in the way of an appropriation to the State exhibit at the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893. Please answer at once.

Respectfully,

J. M. HAMBAUGH,
Springfield, Ill.

House of Representatives.

SPRINGS, BROWN COUNTY, ILL., Jan. 25, 1891.

Wm. F. Hess:

DEAR SIR: Will you please bring this matter before the Alliance at your earliest meeting. Take a secret ballot and send me the result. I am a member of the organization.

Most respectfully,

J. M. HAMBAUGH.

P. S.—Direct as per circular.

W. F. HESS' FIRST LETTER.

PEARL, ILL., Jan. 26, 1891.

Mr. J. M. Hambaugh, Springfield, Ill.:

DEAR SIR AND BRO.:—Your letter and circular received, and it shall receive our attention at the earliest possible moment.

I was not aware that you was a member of the F. A. and I. C. until now, and yet I am puzzled to know how you can be a reformer, such as is expected of an Alliance man, and vote for Palmer or Oglesby, when a thorough reformer and an Alliance man is offered for the place. It would make no difference with me about past party affiliations, when a chance is presented to vote for a person who is strictly identified with the industrial millions. The time has come when old fogies must stand aside and let men of progressive ideas legislate for the debt-ridden people. Both Palmer and Oglesby are in favor of National Banks and a specie basis system; both systems hurtful to man and an enemy to God. You and I, as Alliance men, are strictly opposed to both. Again, we favor a strict control of the transportation lines, and telegraph as well, while they do not. In fact, all Alliance men hold views financially opposite to them. If they have any reform ideas they fail to put them forth.

Mr. Palmer's idea, and singly at that, is electing Senators by a direct vote of the people, which is right, but he never seen that until it was promulgated by the union labor platform. If we Alliance men are not going to use our influence and position to further the cause, what is the use of "organization?" We should rise above party lines and vote to sustain principles, instead of or for the success of partisanship. Is all the relief in this fight to come from our sister organization, the F. M. B. A.? Are our men going to bow to party caucus and let them rear their heads and receive the praise of the only true reformers? I say, never. I am of the opinion, and you are, that enough legislation is and has been done by lawyers and bankers. We Alliance men believe that farmers are better acquainted with the wants than those who live amid palaces. You have a chance to be of use to the people, who are more to be relied upon than party caucus. The Illinois Legislature of '93 will be filled with men who will believe and defend the Alliance

principles. Can we not expect you to give your support to some person who believes in our Alliance demands? I beg of you to accept this in the kindest of feelings, and, with brotherly consideration, write me your opinion.

Fraternally yours,
W. F. HESS,
President Pike County Alliance.

J. M. HAMBAUGH'S SECOND LETTER.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., Feb. 2, 1891.

BRO. HESS:—Yours of January 26 at hand, and as I have nothing to conceal, I have concluded to answer it through the old reliable *Pike County Democrat*, and in so doing, would first ask you to examine the resolutions adopted by the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union Convention, held at Ocala, Florida, and point out to me wherein they differ from the Democratic platform and doctrines, as promulgated by the Democratic party throughout the Union, upon which issues we achieved the glorious victory of last November, by which, like a veritable cyclone, the Republican party was swept from power, and consternation and confusion thrown into the ranks of the monied corporations and plutocrats of the East. Please next inform me wherein the Alliance, as an organization, is in any way connected with this third party movement, and from whence does your authority emanate to solicit my co-operation in behalf of Mr. Streeter. I have been instructed by Alliance officials that the organization does not favor a third party movement, and one of the State officials informs me that Mr. Streeter was not brought out at the solicitation or sanction of the Alliance, and the F. M. B. A.'s are solely responsible for his candidacy and position before the people, and that they must fight it out alone. I am really sorry that you allow your judgment to become so warped as to be "puzzled how I can vote for Palmer." Probably you are not aware that I was elected upon the Democratic ticket, with Gen. Palmer at the head—a statesman who received a popular plurality of over 31,000 of the votes of the State of Illinois, and while I have endorsed him

and his measures, and acknowledged him as our Jeffersonian leader, the people have spoken in unmistakable tones in his behalf; and rest assured that, as true and faithful servants of the popular majority of 31,000 voters, "we will fight it out on that line if it takes all summer." You say, "you have a chance to be of use to the people." Very good; am I not fulfilling my trust and the will of the people by voting for Palmer, when the voice of over 300,000 has spoken, and who "are more to be relied upon than party caucus?"

"The Illinois Legislature of '93 will be filled with men who will defend the Alliance principles." Exactly; and they will be true Jeffersonian Palmer Democrats. When it comes to legislation "for the people," and especially that portion with which I have been closely affiliated, viz., the agricultural classes, I shall stand open to criticism, and ask you to watch my record, and should I not act in accord with the interest of the masses it will be your privilege to cast the seal of condemnation upon me, but I hardly think you can afford to antagonize me on the frail grounds you have instituted. I shall vote for Palmer *ad libitum ad infinitum*.

Most obediently,

J. M. HAMBAUGH.

W. F. HESS' SECOND LETTER.

PEARL, PIKE CO., ILL., Feb. 12, 1891.

Mr. J. M. Hambaugh, Springfield, Ill.:

DEAR SIR AND BRO.: Your answer, together with mine, to your first, appears in the *Pike County Democrat* of Feb. 7th, and you state "you have nothing to conceal," and it is the same with us, and we have concluded to answer your requests publicly, as you seem to think all others but you are afraid of public opinion. Your first request is "to point out the difference between demands of the Alliance adopted at Ocala, Florida, and the Democratic platform and doctrines." Next, you ask wherein the Alliance is connected with a third party movement, and where my authority emanates to solicit your co-operation in behalf of Mr. Streeter. We said nothing about a third party movement, or man, and only asked you if we could not expect

you to give your support to some person who believes in the Alliance demands. You said you would not, or virtually so by saying you would vote for Mr. Palmer. Yet you virtually admit that it is your duty to vote for an Alliance man by saying Mr. Streeter was brought out by the F. M. B. A., and not by the Alliance. Mr. Streeter was put in nomination by Mr. Cockerell, an Alliance man, and seconded by Mr. Moore. This action on their part seems to show that he is the candidate of one as much as the other. You seem to be unconscious of what is going on, as you say your information concerning Streeter's candidacy was received from one of the state officials. It is only reasonable to believe from your statement that you are looking after the success of partisanship, rather than after the principles of the Alliance, from the fact you did not know who was responsible for Mr. Streeter's candidacy until informed by a state official. Is it possible you sat in the house when Mr. Cockerell put in nomination Mr. Streeter, and said, "I nominate him as the Farmers' and Laborers' candidate," and you did not know it of your own knowledge. We hardly think so. The Democratic party has plenty of able men who believe and will defend the Alliance principles. Why not put one of them forward? We venture to say if you did, the party you profess to belong to would not follow you, and you would be hooted out of the party. I did not write you nor solicit you as one of authority, nor are you justifiable in putting any such construction upon the language used. You say, "you have been instructed that the Alliance does not favor a third party." Who said it did? Who said that the Alliance was connected with the third party movement? Your attempt to mislead the people in this manner will not find any friends in the Union. You evade the most important question we asked you in my letter of Jan. 26. The question is, "If the Alliance men are not going to use their influence and position to further the principles of the order, what is the use of organization?" If the organization is only to facilitate the buying cheaper and electing caucus tools to legislate for us, the organization had better disband. If any legislator is so weak that it takes a steering committee to tell him when and how to vote, would not a wooden man do just as well as a human being? And if a

steering committee is going to do it all, the expense of our legislature would be greatly reduced if the members would return home, except the steering committee, who are the dictators of the situation. You surely won't stay there all summer and let a steering committee dictate to you how to vote, even on a motion to adjourn? But you say "you will fight it out on this line if it takes all summer." A reasonable conclusion, then, to be drawn from the language is that the line marked out by the steering committee is the line on which the summer is to be spent. We are aware you was elected by the Democratic party. At the time you was nominated you was a member of the Alliance. Those nominating you knew you had declared yourself in favor of the Alliance principles. They also knew you would support the caucus nominee of the party, or rather the man who was then stumping the State for the Senatorship, on his one idea platform. If they had not known you would desert your avowed Alliance principles, they would not have mentioned you as an available man. You knew who the Democratic candidate would be, and so did they, and yet you accept a nomination and an election at the hands of a party that you would be required to desert Alliance principles to serve the party. If you have proved false to any principle it is the Alliance, because you was a member before you received your nomination. And you cannot vote both, for the principles are antagonistic, as we will show further on. You rely only on the Democratic success in this State for your action in voting for Mr. Palmer. This is an unsafe reliance, for it does not afford you a consistent avenue to escape. You was positive you would be elected, which was correct, but you did not know the Democratic party would carry the State, and if the party had not carried the State that would not have defeated you, yet you would have been for Mr. Palmer just the same. If you contend that the party's majority for State officials should control the Senatorship in the event the State had gone in favor of the Republican party, you to maintain consistency would then be required to vote for Mr. Oglesby. You certainly would have been for Mr. Palmer, no difference what party had carried the State, and the rule was during Republican success for each party to put up a candidate for Senator. At the last election a

decrease in the number of voters shown was over one hundred thousand, and if they had all voted the Republican ticket you would have voted for Palmer for U. S. Senator.

We are not personally acquainted with him, yet we believe he is an honest man, as his record has not, to our limited knowledge, been questioned. In 1868 he was elected Governor of this State, on the Republican ticket. He was then opposed to the Democratic party and its platform. In that year the Democratic platform declares: "3. Payment of the public debt as rapidly as practicable; all money drawn from the people by taxation, except so much as is requisite for the necessities of the government, economically administered, being honestly applied to such payment; and when the obligations of the government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide that they shall be paid in coin, they ought in right and justice to be paid in lawful money of the United States. 4. Equal taxation of every species of property according to its real value, including government bonds and other securities. 5. One currency for the government and the people, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder."

The Republicans were then opposed to each and every one of the planks quoted, and so was Mr. Palmer, for the reason that it is Jefferson Democracy, exactly where the Alliance stands today; and instead of Mr. Palmer changing his financial views, the entire Democratic party went over to him, and, for the proof, we submit the Democratic platform of 1860. It re-affirms the platform of 1856, and states: "Believing that Democratic principles are unchangeable in their nature when applied to the same *subject matter*, we recommend, etc. * * * That the Democratic party will abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on questions of Constitutional law."

If the principles of Democracy are unchangeable, then the party left all principles and went over to Mr. Palmer, for he has not changed his views, nor will he endorse the planks in the above quotations, and he changed party name when the Democrats changed party principles. He says the Government has no constitutional power to issue a *legal tender paper dollar*.

Yet the Supreme Court decides that a legal tender paper dollar is in consonance with our Constitution (Sec. 12 Wallace, p. 567; also same reports, vol. 12, 548). The court has decided one way and Mr. Palmer decides the other, and by the party endorsing him, the party favors the reversal of those decisions which the party's platform said it would abide by in 1860.

The Democrats of Mr. Palmer's type assumed the name in 1872, for in that year the Liberal Republicans met in convention in Cincinnati, and adopted a platform and nominated a Republican, Mr. Greeley, for President; and on the 9th of July following, the Democratic convention met in Baltimore and adopted the *Republican platform* and endorsed their candidate, Mr. Horace Greeley. Then it was that Jefferson Democrats ceased, under the principles, and Palmer-Cleveland Democrats born. But Jefferson principles lived under Peter Cooper, then as Greenbackers, now known as Alliance.

Mr. Tilden wrote a letter to the Democratic convention at St. Louis, in 1876, instructing them "to make their platform as near like the Republicans as possible," and then put Mr. Tilden up as a candidate for President. The truth is, that the principles (if it has any) is a bastard of the Republican party. We will prove before we close that the party has not one principle well defined in its platforms. Let us examine and find out what Jefferson Democracy means. We submit the record of the first platform made by the Democratic National Convention, which convened in Baltimore, May 5, 1840. Aside from slavery, it says "that Congress has no power to charter a United States Bank; that we believe such an institution of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, and dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power, and above the laws and will of the people."

The 7th is in relation to State rights.

"8. That the separation of the monies of the Government from banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds of the Government and the rights of the people."

The principles and tenets of the party, prior to that year, came from the messages and writings of such able men as Jefferson, Madison, Benton, Jackson, Calhoun and others, and adopted by a caucus of Congressmen.

We quote from Jefferson, on his financial views:

"Treasury notes secured by pledges of the faith and credit of the Government, with or without interest, will make better currency than gold or silver."

Mr. Palmer disputes this.

Again, Jefferson says: "The only resource which the Government could command with certainty, the States have unfortunately fooled away, nay, alienated, to swindlers and shavers, under the cover of private banks. Say, too, as an additional evil, that the disposable funds of individuals, that great amounts have thus been withdrawn from improvement and useful enterprise, and employed in the useless, usurious and demoralizing practices of bank directors and their accomplices." Vol. 6, pp. 40 and 41, Jefferson Works.

Again (1813, Vol. 6, pp. 199 and 200): "Bank paper must be suppressed, and the circulating mediums must be restored to the nation, to whom it belongs. It is the only fund on which they can rely for loans; it is the only resource which can never fail them, and it is an abundant one for every purpose. * * * Whereas, the usurpation of that fund by bank paper, obliging them to borrow elsewhere at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., two dollars are required to re-imburse one. So that it is literally true that the toleration of banks of paper discount costs the United States one-half of their war taxes, or, in other words, doubles the expenses of every war." Mr. Palmer disputes this, because his democracy was born in 1872.

Jackson said of the banks: "It is a corrupt and abominable institution, buying up the press and interfering with elections;" and in his paper read to his Cabinet, Sept. 13, 1833, said, concerning the removal of public monies from the banks: "Its responsibility had been assumed after the most mature deliberation and reflection, as necessary to preserve the *morals* of the people, the freedom of the press, and the purity of the election franchise."

Mr. Palmer endorses Cleveland-Manning-Fairchilds' administration, which was a continuation of the Republicans' deposit policy of about \$131,000,000 of the people's money in the National Banks of the East. This does not accord with Jefferson Democracy. Mr. Palmer and the party disputes the constitutional power to issue a full legal tender paper dollar, and so does the present Chief Justice. This is not Jefferson Democracy according to Mr. John C. Calhoun. He was a Democrat, and he said: "I now undertake to affirm positively and without the least fear, that I can be answered what heretofore I have but suggested, that a paper issued by Government with the *simple promise to receive in all dues*, leaving its creditors to take it, or gold or silver, at their option, would, to the extent it would circulate, form a perfect paper circulation which could not be abused by the Government; that it would be as steady and uniform in value as the metals themselves. I will be able to prove that it is within the constitutional power of Congress to use such a paper in the management of its finances, according to the most rigid rules of construing the Constitution."

The doctrines of these eminent men was the foundation for the *quotation* given as appears in the platform of 1860. The platforms of the party were all re-affirmed except the platform of 1868, which stands alone as the corner-stone to mark the time and place where the party left Jefferson-Jackson-Calhoun principles and went over to the mugwump convention in 1872, to be at the birth of the Cleveland-Palmer-Manning-Bayard bastard Democratic party, which could not afford to re-affirm the Democratic principles as promulgated in 1868. All Messrs. Palmer and Trumbull and other Republicans demanded of the Democrats in 1872 was to renounce the financial views of Jefferson Democracy, and declare themselves in favor of Hamilton's banking institutions and a centralization of wealth by law, and they left everything but the name, *Democrat*.

We now submit the testimony of Madison, as appears in his message of Dec. 3, 1816:

"For the interest of the community at large, as well as for the purposes of the Treasury, it is essential that the Nation should possess a currency of equal value, credit and use wherever it may circulate. The Constitution has entrusted Congress

exclusively with the power of creating and regulating a currency of that description."

These quotations ought to convince any imitation of a voter what Democratic principles were prior to 1872, and that Jefferson Democracy is not Cleveland Democracy. But we will produce more testimony as recorded by Mr. Thomas Benton in 1837, "The government ought not to delegate this power if it could. It was too great a power to be trusted to any banking company whatever or to any but the highest and most responsible government."

This was in reference to the establishment of the bank, which Jackson was fighting against. Albert Gallatin, ex-Secretary of the Treasury and President of the Bank of North America in 1838, said:

"The right of issuing paper as currency like that of gold and silver coin, belongs exclusively to the Nation, and cannot be claimed by any individual. * * * * *

We all know that while a bank note bears upon its face a promise to pay the amount of its denomination in coin, it carries with it the implied conditions that it be not asked for." The fact is, prior to the war the brightest lights were against banks of issue and a specie basis, as the following citations will further show. President Harrison, 1840, said, "If there be one measure better calculated than another to produce that state of things so much deprecated by all true Republicans, by which the rich are daily adding to their hoards, and the poor sinking into penury, it is an exclusive metallic currency. If there is a process by which the character of the country for generosity and nobleness of feeling may be destroyed by the great increase and necessary toleration of usury, it is an exclusively metallic currency." Clay said, "I conceive the establishment of this (United States) bank as dangerous to the safety and welfare of the republic." Randolph said, "Charter a bank with thirty-five million dollars, let it establish and learn its powers and then find, if you can, means to 'bell the cat.'" Many more such quotations can be made, but it is no use, for the foregoing is sufficient; that Jefferson Democracy is not believed or practiced by the Palmer-Cleveland-Bayard-Manning Democracy of

to-day, nor has not been since 1868. We will now prove that this bastard Democratic party is in favor of

1. The National Banking System.

2. The depositing of government revenues in the banks.

3. The retirement of the three hundred and forty-six million of legal tenders and converting them into bonds for the use of bankers, at not to exceed 2 1-2 per cent. interest, and to mature only on failure of the bank, if they never failed to draw interest to the end of time.

4. That the party places the bank note above the silver dollar, silver certificate and greenback (people's money) as a sound currency.

5. That the party holds that the people's money is lower in assured value than the National Bank note.

6. That the party is not in favor of a legal tender paper dollar, but in favor of a specie basis system.

In proof of the first proposition, we submit the following evidence: No Democratic platform has declared against it since 1868.

The party put a banker, Wm. English, on the ticket for Vice-President in 1880. The Democratic members of Congress helped to re-charter the banks in 1883.

The Secretary of the Treasury under Cleveland's administration favored their continuation. See Secretary's Report of 1888, page 433, which says:

"The present state of things seems favorable to the substitution of National Bank notes for greenbacks, and to that end I venture to submit for the consideration of Congress the following:

You will remember that the greenbacks, although crippled with the exception clause, saved our country, paid for the blood of the soldier, and plays redeemer for the National Bank note. Yet, for all this, the Democratic party says it's a weak and frail money.

Measures: "1. Funding in bonds the greenback debt of \$346,681,016, or so much of it as may be presented at the Treasury within a limited period of time, say three years.

2. The bonds to be issued only to National Banks presenting greenbacks for that purpose, to bear a low rate of interest

not exceeding 2 1-2 per cent., and to mature only upon the failure of the bank or upon its dissolution. * * * * *

3. The bonds so issued to be available only as a deposit to secure National Bank circulation, and to entitle the banks depositing them to receive circulating notes to the amount of their face." * * * (The above is 10 per cent. better than the Republican party had done.) Cleveland, Fairchilds and the party are responsible for the recommendation, and so is the entire party, for they re-affirmed the platform of 1884 in 1888, at St. Louis, and indorsed Cleveland and his administration.

4. Bayard is a leading Democrat. He said in his speech in New York City, 1880: "I have seen it charged that the Democratic party is a sure foe to the National Banks, but I am at a loss to know the authority for this. The platforms of the party contain no such suggestion and admit of no such construction, and is very certain of that, for the second place on our ticket, for that we have named Mr. Wm. English, of Indiana, one of the ablest financiers and best business men in the whole country whose management of the affairs of a National Bank, of which he was President, was conspicuous for success. (This bank cleared 100 per cent. per annum.) He is certainly good Democratic authority, and he says the platform contains no suggestion and admits of no such construction. So this bastard Democracy is in favor of National Banks, and Jefferson (Alliance) Democracy is not.

In proof of the second proposition, we submit a copy of Mr. Fairchilds' letter, issued by him while Secretary of the Treasury, under Mr. Cleveland. The letter is dated, Washington City, Oct. 8, 1887, and says: "To the Treasurer of the United States, Sir, The Western National Bank of New York City has been designated a United States depository and the security fixed for the present at \$1,100,000 United States 4 per cent. bonds. In order to avoid the usual delay in obtaining a balance by accumulating revenue deposits, I will thank you when the bonds are received to cause to be transferred to said bank from National Bank depositories, other than those in New York City, such amounts as may be deposited therein to the credit of your general account in access of their authorized balances until the sum of \$1,100,000 is reached. Which amount the Western

National Bank will be authorized to hold as a fixed balance. Respectfully yours, C. S. Fairchilds, Sec'y."

The farmers could not have mortgaged one hundred million acres of the best land in the United States and got the money from the same source. The above letter proves the second proposition, of giving or loaning the people's money to rich bankers to hold as a fixed balance. That means, they can consider that they can hold it and speculate on it and corrupt the morals of the people, the freedom of the press and the purity of election franchise. Jackson removed the deposits, he said, to preserve the morals of the people, etc. There is a wide difference between Jackson Democracy and Palmer-Cleveland Democracy.

In proof of the third proposition, we refer you to the report of the Secretary, Mr. Fairchilds, 1888, on page 433, as above quoted. In proof of our fourth proposition as to what the Democratic party thought of greenbacks and National Bank notes, the same report and page, the Secretary says: "The \$346,000,000 of greenbacks are the weak point in our currency system. The gold coins and certificates stand first, the National Bank notes next, the silver coins and certificates third, the greenbacks last in the order of assured value, and it would be a great benefit to the whole mass of the currency if this, its frailest element, could be eliminated from it." And then proceeds on the funding scheme as given above, explaining how to get them out of the way and make room for more bonds and bank notes. Contrast this with what Jefferson, Calhoun, and others said. And yet your Democratic party endorsed Cleveland and his policy in convention in 1888. Same proof answer for the fifth proposition. In proof of the sixth proposition we quote from your party platform of 1880. The third plank says: "Home rule, honest money, consisting of gold and silver and paper convertible into coin on demand." The convertible paper is all a specie basis could ever mean and this convertible paper is to be National Bank notes, which carries an implied promise that the coin will not be asked for. If it was always to be asked for no bank could long stand the conversion. No wonder Bayard admitted that the party favored National Banks. This is what the party meant by sound currency in its platform

of 1872, and re-affirmed up to 1888. The facts show that the Palmer-Cleveland-Bayard-Manning-Fairchilds bastard Democracy is identical with the Republican party on the financial question, the greatest question of questions.

In the first platform adopted by the bastard Democracy in 1872 we find it says, in the fifth plank: "To this end it is imperatively demanded that no President shall become a candidate for re-election." This was re-affirmed in all of the conventions and also in 1888, and then nominate Cleveland for re-election. And Cleveland said, "No President should be re-elected." So the party states one principle in the platform and violates it in making the nomination in the same convention. The fact is the party will do anything in the line of promises to get office, and is manipulated by men who are identified with all forms of monopolies. We have discovered no Jefferson Democracy in it so far. The platform of 1888 says: "Chief among its principles of party faith are the maintenance of an indissoluble union of free and independent States." It seems the chief of its principles it got from General Palmer, under his teachings during the war. It took him and other Republicans now in Democratic ranks, about five years to convince the party that this principle was correct. The Democratic States were not only brought back into the Union, but on the ruins of shattered Democracy he and others constructed this bastard Democratic party, no doubt for the purpose of riding into office, as the Democratic party here in Illinois are prone to run for office men who are relics of Republicanism, and hope thereby to catch Republican votes, simply because Mr. Palmer or Trumbull have been Republicans. And the Democratic member of the Illinois Legislature are doing for Palmer what he himself condemns. We quote from his speech delivered at Sycamore, Ill.: "The man who will allow anybody to think for him, to vote for him, any man who will follow his prejudices and disregard the dictation of his judgment, at the behest of politicians or party, is simply failing in his duty as a good citizen." (*St. Louis Republic*, Sept. 12, 1888, daily). He condemns each of you who are trying to elect him. In the same speech he says, "I am a Democrat and a firm adherent of its principles and a great admirer of Presi-

dent Cleveland, whom I regard as one of the greatest men of the age." He endorses Cleveland's administration of finance, banks, bonds, taxation, anti-silver, anti-pension, deposit of public money in banks, eviction of the homesteaders in Iowa by tools of railroad companies, etc. If Mr. Palmer esteems him one of the greatest men of the age he surely will not take exception to his official acts. The only question likely to arise in the minds of the people in regard to the first quotation of Mr. Palmer is who is right about the steering committee, you or Mr. Palmer? If he is wrong the steering committee should put him right. It is useless to say Mr. Palmer closed the above speech referred to with a magnificent argument on the tariff. We will now prove that the campaigns fought on the platforms of 1872, 1876, 1880 and 1884 were on dead issues and dextrous evasions of living issues. And for the proof we submit an editorial which appeared in the *St. Louis Republic* (Democratic) of June 8, 1888, daily. The Democrats held the National Convention at St. Louis in 1888, so it got the opinion from the convention, says: "Of the platform put forth by the convention for its candidate to stand upon it may fairly be said that it closes one political era and marks the opening of another, it closes the era of campaigns fought on the dead and buried issues of the times, and marks the opening of a new era in which the Democratic party at least goes to the people with a square and unqualified proclamation of the party creed and faith regarding the most momentous question that has confronted the country since the question arising out of slavery were settled by the arbitrament of the sword."

Well, this is pretty hard to know that the first time that the bastard Democracy got squarely before the people on what it called a living issue; it was sacrificed upon its record no doubt for misleading its members on dead issues and dextrously evading living ones. He who deals in sham politics must suffer. We will now prove that for forty years prior to 1888 the issue for "tariff for revenue" against protection was not plainly presented, but was considered a straddle and unique verbiage, and for the proof we quote from an editorial which appeared in the daily issue of the *St. Louis Republic*, dated June 7, 1888. It says, under the caption of "Harmonized," "The Democratic

party and the country at large are to be congratulated upon the fact that the Committee on Platform and Resolutions has reached an agreement which is satisfactory to both the elements or factions represented in the Committee and that a report will be presented by Mr. Watterson this morning, that is *likely* to be adopted by the Convention without a dissenting vote. Senator Gorman and his friends have carried their point in having the platform of 1884 re-affirmed, and the tariff reformers have obtained all they wanted in securing the authoritative assertion that that platform is no longer to be regarded as a straddle, but is correctly interpreted by President Cleveland's message pronouncing squarely and unequivocally in favor of a reduction of the tariff duties. It is understood that both sides are contented with the concession made, though it looks very much like the tariff reformers had carried the day. Of course none of them entertains any desire to discredit the platform of 1884, or felt any real reluctance to re-affirm its statement of Democratic doctrine. The only dissatisfaction they have at any time felt with it was that it was susceptible of being interpreted in a protectionist sense, and as a matter of fact, was claimed by the protectionists Democrats as a protectionists document. To re-affirm it in the sense placed upon it by President Cleveland's message is equivalent to repudiating all that portion of it that can be looked upon as a straddle, and is tantamount to accepting President Cleveland's *message as the platform of the Democratic party*.

And this is as it should be. It is the logical sequence of the unanimous nomination of Mr. Cleveland yesterday. The eternal fitness of things demanded that if President Cleveland was again to be the nominee of his party, he should be placed fairly and squarely upon the declaration of principles upon which, more than six months ago, he staked the issues of his nomination and re-election. Again we say the committee, the party and the country are to be congratulated. For the first time in upwards of *forty years* the issue of a tariff for revenue against a tariff for protection is plainly presented, without any verbiage that can be a straddle or a dodge. It is *fortunate* that this consummation most devoutly to be wished, has been reached without any unseemly wrangle in the convention. The opponents

of reform deserve the thanks of the people for yielding gracefully to the will of the people."

The platform of 1888, as referred to above, was a compromise, and was dictated by Cleveland himself, as it has stated, and for that reason the committee could not agree only on such as Mr. Cleveland dictated in his message only six months before. A compromise only implies that both sides make a sacrifice, and it shows plainly the Democratic party is not together on the tariff, and it certainly does not leave your party with any one well-defined principle. It is not any wonder now that Mr. Morrison, a Democrat, could not get the horizontal bill of 20 per cent. reduction through the House of Congress with a majority of forty Democrats, because the *St. Louis Republic* virtually says it was a meaningless platform. It does seem that a party ought to be able to define a principle in upwards of forty years. If you construe the platform of 1880 as a tariff for revenue platform, you are mistaken.

We will now prove by Mr. R. Q. Mills that the message of Cleveland, upon which his platform of 1888 was constructed, gave the woollen manufactures more protection than the Republican tariff gave them, and would have lowered prices of wool. House Tariff Bill No. 9051, reported through Mr. Mills, chairman of Committee on Ways and Means, said in the report: "In response to the President's recommendations, beg leave to report to the House a bill to prevent the accumulation of surplus revenue, by reducing the present excessive and unjust rates of taxation imposed upon the people." Here is a virtual admission that if the Government was using all the revenue derived, that a reduction of the excessive and unjust rates of tariff would not be recommended, as in response to Cleveland's message. The reduction is not asked for the sake of reducing the "unjust and excessive" taxes, but to prevent a surplus and to reduce tariff rates meant to prevent a surplus. But it was the only way to hoodwink the people into making them believe that they would attack the Republicans' protection policy. Mills and Cleveland wanted to please both Eastern and Western Democrats. Mr. Mills says Cleveland called their attention only to the large surplus, and asked for its prevention. Cleveland did not call their attention to the campaign cry of "pro-

tection robbery," nor can any one find in his message or platform against protection, but, in fact, upholds it; and to please the voters, they pretend to attack the protection policy under the guise to reduce the surplus. This is what the *Republic* meant by "dexterous evasions;" and to prove the Democratic party is in favor of protection, see Mills' speech, July 21, 1888: "Now we come to wool and woollens. We found the duty on that schedule, under existing law, averaging \$58.81, and we have left it at \$38.69, a reduction of \$20 on every \$100 worth. This reduction seems large, but it was caused by eliminating wool from the calculation and putting it on the free list. The reduction on dutiable woollen goods amounts to \$12,000,000. But the woollen manufacturer is not injured; he is benefited. The woollen manufacturer, by the existing (Republican) law, gets compensation for the [Mr. Mills already begins to court favor from both sides by offering explanation of the large reduction. Why, if he is honest with his voters, say it is simply robbery, unjust, to have so much protection on woollen goods and wools; if the farmer can stand free wool, the manufacturers can stand free woollen goods] taxation on wool, and 35 per cent. protection for the manufactured product. By our bill we give him free wool and 40 per cent. protection on his manufactured goods. Instead of being injured, he is positively benefited to the amount of \$5 in the \$100 more than he is by the existing law."

If this means anything, it is just what he says, and if his bill gives \$5 better protection to the woollen manufacturer, some one had to lose the \$5 they gained by the bill, and your party claims "that the rate of tariff increases the price to the amount of the rate;" and if it does, then by putting wool on the "free list" the price of wool went down accordingly, and the producer lost what Mr. Mills says they (the manufacturers) gained.

We will now prove, further on, this, and connectedly, that the party appeared to want to please the manufacturers more than the producers. See report to accompany Bill, H. R., 9051, * * * To take the foreign market from the foreign manufacturer, we must produce our goods at a lower cost than he can. The principal elements of cost are labor and material. In many of our manufactures the labor cost is lower than in

any country in the world, and if the cost of material were as low here as in foreign countries, we could produce our goods more cheaply than they, and largely increase our exports to foreign markets." He pleads here for a scheme to cheapen materials, and by putting wool on the free list, and compel the American wool producer to sell his wool cheaper, in order that the manufacturer could have the entire benefit of "cheap labor and material," and by being thus armed, our manufacturers could take the markets of the world away from the European manufacturers, notwithstanding they have pauper labor and tenant farmers (wool producers). What! Is it possible that Palmer Democrats indorse the putting of "labor and materials" as low as in Europe?

Mr. Mills tries hard to escape the conclusion, but it is irresistible, and then he denies that the tariff effects prices, for in his speech, July 21st, 1888, he says: "Every one knows that the price of commodities in the market is fixed by the amount of money in actual circulation, and when the circulation is depleted prices fall, property shrinks in value, and *loans* and mortgages increase. The load grows heavier on the back of the debtor, and his pathway grows darker and his struggle harder day by day. Those who have means and who have been excused from sharing with their fellow citizens the burdens of taxation, find their fortunes improved, while the less favored citizen, who must live by his daily toil, finds himself anxiously inquiring how he is to obtain employment and support for himself and those dependent on him. Depleting the channels of circulation necessarily arrests consumption. When ability to buy the things that want requires is decreasing, the demand for them will decrease in the same proportion, and when the demand decreases the production will correspondingly decrease, then employment is restricted, laborers are reduced or discharged, and suffering, distress and discontent are seen on every hand." This doctrine is endorsed by the best political economists of the country. If, then, the above is correct, all of his argument on the tariff controlling prices is false. He, by his bill's application, expected that the pauperized consumers of Europe are getting sufficient wages to largely purchase our manufactured products at such prices as would justify the payment of good

wages to the manufacturing laborers of this country. If this is not his theory I cannot correctly construe his committee's words on page 3 of the Report (accompanying the bill No. 9051) which states, "What we need is manufacturers enough to consume all the annual products of these materials (cotton, hemp, flax, hides, ores and other materials of manufacture) and create an active demand for them so that all our workmen may be constantly employed and receive *high prices for their labor*." He is evidently going to "create an active demand" for them by capturing the foreign markets of the world. And now, if the prices of raw materials can be reduced by this bill, he says the labor cost is lower here than in any other country in the world, the markets can be captured. If this capturing is done a greater portion of the laborers of foreign manufactures will be thrown out of employment and then their ability to buy our goods will be destroyed and then the foreign markets cease. But perhaps all of the slum's inmates, criminals, drunkards, paupers and others will come to protected America and go to work at good prices created by Mr. Mills' bill, and whether they come or not he should tell us how to maintain good prices for the laborers engaged in producing the raw material of manufacture if the prices of the same are to go down, to capture the markets. This cheap labor and material is evidently what the Democratic party wants, and just what the farmers and laborers do not want, and are now, and have been kicking since 1873, and yet this theory of lowering and raising of prices of labor and raw materials and reducing tariff taxation and greater benefit to the woolen manufacture and preventing surplus is all boiled into four and six-tenths per cent., and the excess of surplus is on fifty million dollars, about seventy-five cents per capita. "This per cent. was just enough for the hypocrites to quarrel over all summer in order to keep laborers and the producers of raw materials divided. The only difference between the two great political parties (if there is any) is only slight, and party lines are destroyed in adjusting the tariff duties, provided the adjustment injures their State's industries. Democrats and Republicans join to prevent any adjustment of the tariff when the industries of their States is affected by the adjustment.

We will now give the difference in the per cents. made by the Mills' bill and the then existing Republican protection law. On schedule A, chemical products, $4\frac{7}{10}$ per cent.; on schedule B, earthen and glassware, $7\frac{3}{10}$ per cent.; on schedule C, metals, $2\frac{3}{10}$ per cent.; on schedule D, wood and woodenware, $\frac{6}{10}$ of 1 per cent. (life almost extinct); on schedule E, sugar, $15\frac{8}{10}$ per cent. (patient revived); on schedule F, tobacco, 0 (sinking close to free whisky license); on schedule G, provisions, $\frac{9}{10}$ per cent. (patient got too much bad whisky); on schedule H, liquors, 0; on schedule I, cotton and cotton goods, $\frac{2}{10}$ of 1 per cent. (patient sinking); on schedule J, hemp, jute and flax goods, $6\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. (temperature above normal of $4\frac{6}{10}$, bad whisky will raise it); on schedule K, wool and woolens, $20\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. (patient will die from effects of too much free license whisky); on schedule L, silk and silk goods, 0 (doctors agree that death is sure and near); on schedule M, books, papers, etc., $\frac{7}{10}$ of 1 per cent; on schedule N, sundries, 0 (patient dies). The old party doctors could not exactly tell what did kill and wipe out all principles between the Democrats and Republicans, and after a few months of wrangling they agreed to submit to a cranky Prohibition doctor; so the crank was called, and after looking up the records of death rate resulting from whisky, and the effects it had on political ethics, he said, judging from the manner of the patient (principle) at the time of and preceding death, and being treated in the manner that it was, death was caused by the following recipe, prepared and dosed out by Drs. Mills (Democrat) and McKinley (Republican):

PRESCRIPTION.

Sec. 40. That all clauses of section thirty-two hundred and forty-four of Revised Statutes, and all laws amendatory thereof, and all other laws which impose any special taxes upon manufacturers of stills, retail dealers in liquors and retail dealers in malt liquors, are hereby repealed.

The foregoing liquor license clause appears in the depths of the Mills' bill under the title, "To reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue." The Prohibition Dr. said the dose known as "repealed," was the

main and deadly dose, and that death would not have occurred so soon but it was only a question of time anyway. Death, of course, occurred Nov. 1888, and the remains were buried in David B. Hill's cemetery near New York City, March 4th, 1888. It is useless to say that Messrs. Cleveland, Thurman, Palmer and other bereaved RELICS (of the tussle) attended the funeral. Mr. David B. Hill, Democratic Governor of New York, Master of Ceremonies, ably assisted by President Ben Harrison, pall bearers Messrs. Reed, Cannon, Blaine and McKinley, Mr. Ingalls, orator. This gentleman recently lost his speech, caused by swallowing an Alliance solution during an "iridescent dream." The Prohibition decision was violently disputed, and a jury of eminent logicians was called, and after scrutinizing closely, they decided deceased came to his death from the effects of a sunstroke received in *a drunken revel during a hand scramble for office*, and that it was not of or concerning the effects of any political principles of difference between deceased and his opponent, for there was none, and that such a death was yearly looked for, because Mr. Cleveland had said "that there was no political difference between them," and the jury justified themselves in their verdict, that a sunstroke was received during a drunken revel in a hand scramble for office, and to justify themselves in their verdict they submitted Mr. Cleveland's message of Dec. 6; 1887, which said, "The question thus imperatively presented for solution should be approached in a spirit higher than partisanship, and considered in the light of that regard for patriotic duty which should characterize the action of those entrusted with the weal of a confiding people. But the obligation to declared party policy and principle is not wanting to urge prompt and effective action. BOTH of the great political parties now represented in the government have by repeated and authoritative declarations condemned the condition of our laws, which permit the collection from the people of unnecessary revenue, and have, in the most solemn manner, promised its correction; and neither as citizens or partisans are our countrymen in a mood to condone the deliberate violation of the pledges." You cannot find a defined principle in the depths of Democratic platforms with a drag net. Why? Because this is the message that Mr. Cleve-

land staked the issues of 1888, and the same was accepted as a "correct interpretation" of the platform of 1888. It is no wonder the protection element was "satisfied" with the platform of 1888. (See *St. Louis Republic*, June 7th, 1888, says under the caption of "Harmonized," heretofore quoted.) The following quotation is from the same message, and is no doubt the paragraph the protection Democrats relied on when it was accepted as the "correct interpretation" of the party's faith, and endorsed by the whole party. Same message again: "Our progress towards a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much bandying epithets. It is a condition which confronts us—not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a *slight* reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire *withdrawal* of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant; and the persistent claim made in certain quarters that all efforts to relieve the people from unjust and unnecessary taxation are schemes of *so-called free traders* is mischievous and far removed from any consideration for the *public good*." The slight reduction referred to was the $4\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. asked for by the Mills' bill, because the bill was reported in response to the President's message, and the "correct interpretation" of the party's creed and faith, as announced by the Democratic party in St. Louis, 1888. (Don't forget this, we do not want to quote it any more.) Again, same message:

"Nor can the presentation made of such considerations be, with any degree of fairness, regarded as evidence of unfriendliness toward our manufacturing interests, or of any lack of appreciation of their value and importance."

We would like to know where the low-tariff Democrats can find any solace in any of Cleveland's messages or platforms. No man can find a word in the platform of 1888 that will admit of any reasonable construction as being opposed to the Republicans' protection policy. It is pretty hard for members of the Democratic party to vote the same ticket, and have no knowledge what each other's political faith or principles are. We

know they have the same name, yet, are they related? is the question.

The low-tariff Democrats had the gall to snub and boo-hoo around at that funeral heretofore mentioned. They must have been hypocrites, or were bawling and snubbing over the thing they pretend to despise. You "mischievous free traders" had better be on the look-out, and have better sentinels than you had in 1872, when Palmer captured you, or Blaine will capture you in 1892 with his reciprocity scheme, which is nearer absolute "free trade" than any other which has yet been announced. But Mr. Cleveland says the talk of so-called "free trade is irrelevant and mischievous." He also says: "The destruction of the advantages we award our home productions should not be contemplated." Why? Because Mr. Cleveland says "it is far removed from any considerations for the public good." Then Democrats talk of a "tariff for revenue" as against a "tariff for protection," in the face of all the facts, is simply an exhibition of hypocrisy, or of downright ignorance. In his letter of acceptance, September 8, 1888, he says: "We have entered upon no crusade of free trade. The reform we seek to inaugurate is predicated upon the utmost care for our established industries (and infant industries as well) and enterprises. * * * We are dealing with no imaginary danger. Its existence has been repeatedly confessed by all political parties, and *pledges of remedy* have been made on *all* sides." This proves your party did not contemplate "free trade or reciprocity," but a tariff would be maintained by your party's reform principle, "predicated upon the utmost care for the established industries," and the evil "has been confessed and pledges have been made by all on all sides." And yet they say there is a vast difference between the old parties. There is none, and if there was, it would only be $4\frac{1}{6}$ per cent., because Mr. Cleveland only asked for a "slight reduction of advantage awarded home production." He positively admits the Republicans' protection is right and should not be withdrawn.

You might say Mr. Cleveland did not answer the party correctly. Well, let the *St. Louis Republic* say how Cleveland stood in his party. June 7, 1888 (daily issue), it says of him: "He is President of the United States, the idol of his party,

and will lead it again to victory." Well, he was defeated, and I suppose the "protectionist Democrats" had yielded more in the "compromise platform" than they could cram down New York and Pennsylvania and other Democrats. The least that can be said of Mr. Cleveland in this connection is that he is the "idol of his party."

The *St. Louis Republic*, June 6th, 1888 (daily issue), in editorial, says, concerning the two elements on the Committee on Platform and Resolutions: "That scheme was disclosed several days ago and is still the rallying of the protectionists on the committee. It is to 're-affirm' or to 'endorse' the platform of 1884 and to substitute this *meaningless mummer*y for a definite utterance regarding the conviction and policy of the party in this year of grace. Such an evasion as this—such a pitiful confession of weakness and indecision—would actually be worse than a newly devised straddle, because the people thoroughly understand how that platform (1884) was constructed and what it means and could in no wise be deceived by it."

The platform of 1884, was a "straddle and meaningless mummer"y" and dextrous evasions of living issues. Yet it was re-affirmed and the party endorsed Mills' Bill, Cleveland, his administration and his message, based on the platform of 1884. And the party accepted his message as a "correct interpretation" of both platforms and of the party's creed and faith, and the party put itself squarely before the people (with all of the above absurdities) for the first time in forty years. Its queer how long it takes the Cleveland-Bayard-Manning-Mills-Palmer Democrats to develop a principle clear enough to go before the people for their suffrages and not mean anything definite. If they were right in 1884 the party was false in 1888, and if right in 1888, it was false in 1884, and if it was false then it will be false in 1892. It is reasonable to believe they lied all the time, because they falsified each platform.

Your party was surely wrong about putting so much stress on a slight reduction of the tariff to cure the ills of the country, such as pools, combines, trusts, and was of aggregated capital as that was not your highest principle, as your platform of 1888 says, "Chief among its principles of party faith are the main-

tainance of an indissoluble union of free and indestructable states now about to enter upon its second century of unexampled progress and renown." Your chief principles accords exactly with the Republicans, and they acknowledge its "unexampled progress and renown." If the country is enjoying "unexampled progress and renown," as you admit, you must go farther and say that it is the result of the protective policy of the Republicans, because you have not passed any taxation laws and the party claims the country's prosperity depends upon tariff taxation. Your party's platforms, reports, messages, speeches and press falsifies all you say.

Again, the same platform says: "The Democratic party welcome an exacting scrutiny of the administration of the executive power, which, four years ago, was committed to its trust in the election of Grover Cleveland President of the United States, and it challenges the most searching inquiry concerning its fidelity and devotion to the pledges which then invited the suffrage of the people. The party admits that it is not ashamed of, 1. National Banks; 2. Depositing the people's money in the banks, as fixed balances; 3. Recommend the suspension of the silver dollar; 4. Saying the silver dollar was worth only 99 cents (We hope plenty of laborers in our community, who offer one hundred cents worth of labor for the silver dollar, and a few individuals who want a wagon-load of corn at 99 cents, pass them this way, please, you gold dollar National Bank note Democrats); 5. Wanting to fund the 346 million of the people's legal tender into endless bonds, to draw interest, and for the banker's sole use and benefit, and then grant 10 per cent. more blackbacks than they received by the Republican law. To retire the people's legal tender means to replace them with National Bank notes, so the people can pay more taxes, more interest on bonds, and more interest on the circulation of the banks. The party does not consider this a violation of its pledges, and the party has the cheek to say that the legal tenders are the frailest element in our currency, and that the bankers' notes are better for assured value than the people's legal tender. When the people assure value to both, from the fact that the people's bonds are behind the bank notes, and the people's legal tender has to play redeemer for the National

Bank note. The party does not consider this excessive and against taxation.

The idea of the people's legal tender being a redeemer for the National Bank, and then the lowest in "assured values," and the frailest element of the currency, is pernicious lying. Such utter disregard of truth and honesty as the above proposition is of such a degree of infamy and blasphemy that the goddess of liberty could not escape seduction at the party's hands; and upon such propositions the Palmer-Bayard-Manning-Mills-Cleveland Democracy "welcome exacting scrutiny and challenges inquiry of its devotion and pledges." This seems to settle beyond any doubt what the people may expect on the finance question.

Again, same platform says: "During a most critical period of our financial affairs, resulting from over-taxation, the anomalous condition of our currency and a public debt immatured, it has, by a wise and conservative course, not only averted disaster, but greatly promoted the prosperity of the people." Yes, the "critical period" of the finances did happen, but not from over-taxation, from the fact that Mills' "excessive surplus" was only fifty millions of dollars, as stated in his committee report, but the "critical period" was a scheme of the bankers and bond holders to realize on the bonds, and the bastard Democracy tumbled to the scheme and began offering a premium on the bonds to get to pay them. See Secretary's report, 1888, page 27. He says, under the circular April 17th, 1888, "nearly all bonds offered have been bought by the government that have been offered at *some price*. The amount purchased was ninety-four million, and we paid about eighteen millions for the privilege of buying them, and in the 297 bank depositories he deposited about one hundred and thirty-five million dollars. This is your party's "wise and conservative" course the "averted disaster" was to the banks, and the "promoted prosperity" was rendered to the bondholders and bankers.

The "unmatured public" debt would have melted away like the frost before the morning sun had they the courage and spirit of Jefferson Democracy. This kind of Democracy declared in a platform in 1836: "We hold that each and every law or act of incorporation passed by preceding legislatures can

be rightfully altered and repealed by their successors, and that they should be altered or repealed when necessary for the public *good*, or when required by a majority of the people."

Again, Jefferson Democrats says, in platform of 1848:

"That it is the duty of every branch of government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the government, and for the gradual but certain extinction of the debt created by the prosecution of a just and necessary war."

Of the first quotation, platform of 1836, why didn't your party repeal the charters of the National Bank and repeal the law concerning the time of payment, and say they were declared payable? The answer is that the Democratic party of to-day is not Jefferson's Democracy. Of the quotation of the platform of 1848, we must say that we are positive that you have not applied the tariff revenue for "gradual and certain extinction of the debt," and surely your party knows all about the "just and necessary war." But as your party invites "exacting scrutiny" we must proceed with the Democratic platform of 1888, which says, "While carefully guarding the interests of the taxpayers (not interest payers) and conforming strictly to the principles of justice and equity, it has paid out more for pensions and bounties to the soldiers and sailors of the Republic than was ever before during an equal period." Well, if wool must go on the free list, why not cotton and cotton goods and all necessities? You know the difference between the Republicans and Democrats on schedule I. Cotton goods and cotton was only ninety-two hundredths of one per cent., and on woodenware and wood only six-tenths of one per cent. If free wool is "justice and equity" so is all necessities and schedule I as well. You skimmed "justice and equity" with exacting scrutiny. Your party paid no attention to the debt ridden mortgage, interest paying farmers, paying premiums on bond for the privilege of paying them is "exacting scrutiny" and "justice and equity" is as consistent as averting the critical period by your party conservative course in the finances. The above was done by the Democratic party by conforming strictly to the principles of injustice and inequity. Your bastard Democratic party may have paid more "pension and bounties,"

but if you did, it was according to Republican law or its sanction, and if your party followed "justice and equity" it did not conform to it, paying the General's widow five thousand dollars per year and the poor private's wife one hundred and forty-four dollars per year, and your party could have paid more if Mr. Cleveland had not vetoed the "dependent pension bill," which the Democrats and Republicans said was justice and equity.

The substitute Cleveland vetoed, the pension bill that would have pensioned some soldiers over six-two years of age of the late war, but signed one to pension those of sixty-two or over that were soldiers in the Mexican war. If justice demands a pension for Mexican soldiers over sixty-two (this was one provision in the bill) equity shigs up and says, give the soidiers of the late war the same when they arrive at sixty-two. (We had two neighbors, both sixty-two, one of the late war and one of the Mexican, and Cleveland vetoed for the soldier of the late war and approved for the Mexican. Justice and equity no doubt went with McGinty.) And yet Mr. Palmer congratulated him on vetoing the dependent pension bill, an insult to the boys who marched by his orders, and now some of them in rags and destitution, and in face of all the Palmer-Cleveland bastard Democracy was all endorsed by the whole party in St. Louis, June 5, 1888.

Again, same platform says, "Capital is discouraged, without doubt, and unjust and unequal laws can neither be repealed or amended." Of course labor is encouraged in poverty and suffering, and no difference, they must pay \$5 more protection. And to settle capital all the party has to do is to follow its rule of "equity and justice" by giving them more bonds, premiums, deposit more of the people's money in their banks, and capital will soon settle and be ready to contribute to the campaign fund. The reason, we suppose, was that "justice and equity" was kept so busy, that the Democratic platform of 1884 was "meaningless mumumery and dextrous evasion of living issues." No doubt the party wants to repeal or amend some law to help capital, and not labor, or it would have said so in this connection. Again, platform of 1888 says: "Upon its record thus exhibited and upon a pledge of a continuance to the people of the benefits of good government, the National Democracy

invokes a renewal of popular trust by the re-election of a chief magistrate who has been faithful, able and prudent."

It does not appear to me like there is any Jefferson Democracy in the above, nor is there any consolation to those who do respect Jefferson. Your suffrage was asked upon the "record" and upon the pledges of a "continuance of the same." This means to repeat the record by the party's rule of "equity and justice," to the bankers, bondholders, manufactures, rich general's widow and veto pension bill to keep "soldiers from per-juring themselves," and be faithful to "disturbed capital" on your "conservative courses" during the "critical period" at which time the bankers, bondholders and financial pirates escaped the party's "seeming disaster."

It is queer how "capital gets discouraged" and the poor farmers and laborers rest encouraged, and continue to keep the country in "unexampled prosperity, progress and renown," and at the same time destitute of food, clothes, home, happiness, and facing the world's batters with nothing but absolute idleness. (See Mills' report of bill.) And yet, in face of this, encouraged labor is satisfied with that kind of progress and renown, while capital is discouraged, starving, and yet getting rations from the government treasury as a "fixed balance," and the capitalists' bonds being purchased by the government at 28 per cent. premium, and the farmers' land 50 per cent. below par, and no sale.

Again, same platform says; "It has adopted and consistently pursued a firm and prudent foreign policy, preserving peace with all nations, while scrupulously maintaining all the rights and interests of our own government and people at home and abroad. Well, was Bayard and Cleveland prudent, firm and consistent in the Mexican matter over —————, a citizen? Those heathen Mexicans actually had to teach our two learned gentlemen the first principles of the law of nations, and expound the treaty between the two countries. But for good hard sense let us quote Jefferson's platform, on which he was elected. It says, in the sixth plank: "Free commerce with all nations, political connection with none, and *little* or no diplomatic establishments." This needs no comment. The boasted Democratic party simply exhibits no respect for Jefferson whatever.

Again, the Democratic platform of 1888 says: "Of all the industrious freemen of our land, an immense majority, including every tiller of the soil, gain no advantage from excessive tax laws, but the price of *nearly* everything they buy is increased by the favoritism of an unequal system of tax legislation."

This clause is surely useless, for it is "capital that is discouraged and kicking, and not the laborers." You say here the price of "*nearly* everything is increased" by "excessive and unjust tax laws." Well, if that is the case, just put in a little more wool and premiums on bonds and bank deposits, and retire the people's money into endless bonds for National bankers' benefit, and let the laborers pay interest on circulation and bonds, for by this method you can relieve "every tiller of the soil" (Alliance) from "unjust and excessive taxation," and relieve "discouraged capital." But to fully explain why you should do the above, we quote from platform again: "It is repugnant to the creed of Democracy that by such taxation the cost of the necessities [wool] of life should be unjustly increased to all our people." This increase could be overlooked if the "surplus" did not accumulate, and by the message, a *slight* reduction will even up all things except the "favoritism shown to discouraged capital." Put more free wool in the hopper, and grind out another grist for the "undisturbed and encouraged laborers."

Again, the same platform says: "Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed, when, by '*unnecessary taxation*,' trusts and combinations are permitted and fostered which will unduly enrich the few that combine to rob the many of our citizens, by depriving them of natural competition."

Then we are to understand that it is all right for trusts and combines to rob and plunder the "undisturbed labor" so long as they are not "fostered and permitted" by "unnecessary taxation," but if it is done by a tariff for "necessary taxation," it cannot be legislated against, but such trust and combines will be "permitted and fostered," no difference whether the people's interests are "betrayed" or not, or whether the people get natural competition. Put in more "free wool," "\$5 protection bank deposits," "bonds," retire greenbacks, and issue

endless bonds, ten per cent. more bank notes on the bonds, coffee combines, etc., and grind out a grist of satisfaction for "discouraged capital," and keep on "betraying the people's trust" by paying twenty-five per cent. premium on bonds, deposits of public money, so that "undisturbed labor," noted for "progress and renown," will have some burden to bear by paying premiums, interest on bonds and interest on National Bank circulation, and pay State, County and local tax on the bonds held by the "discouraged capitalists."

Again, same platform says, "Every Democratic rule of governmental action is violated when through unnecessary taxation a vast sum of money far beyond [fifty million] the needs of an economical administration is drawn from the people, and channels of trade, and accumulated as a demoralizing surplus in the national treasury. The money now lying idle in the federal treasury, resulting from superfluous taxation, amounts to more than one hundred and twenty-five million and the surplus is reaching the sum of more than sixty million annually."

Yes, exactly, every rule of Jefferson-Jackson Democracy is violated, creating 297 National Banks as holders of public money, but not Cleveland bastard Democracy; this word "unnecessary" is your party's shibboleth, the party evidently did not "include the one hundred and thirty-one millions, in the banks," in connection of the vast sum of only "fifty millions," a result of "unnecessary taxation." This sum could soon be exhausted in paying premiums on bonds at 25 per cent. bonus. If it was a "demoralizing surplus," why let it more than double in four years of Democratic rule? You evidently demoralize your party worse than "discouraged capital." If the election of 1888 is evidence, the excess of "necessary taxation" only reached about "sixty millions annually." The party could have cured it very easily by the Mills' bill by simply lowering the tariff to five and six-tenths per cent., or nearly so. The only trouble seems to have been the "established industries" could not stand the *slight* reduction of advantages granted them, as free trade was "mischievous and irrelevant." Again, platform says that more than one hundred and twenty-five millions are lying idle in the treasury as a result of superfluous taxation, and makes a "demoralizing surplus." Well, you know the three

hundred and forty-six millions of legal tenders are declared to be unredeemable, no time being set for their redemption and are on a par with gold. And yet there has and is now one hundred millions of gold dollars held in the treasury for their redemption, so by applying the redemption fund to payment of the debt, all the "demoralizing surplus" would have been exhausted, except twenty-five millions, and in order to get this in circulation all you had to do was to follow your party rule of "equity and justice" and deposit it in the banks for them to loan to the people. This would have met the approval of the "undisturbed and encouraged labor," and the "discouraged capital," and accorded with "equity and justice" dealt out to the taxpayers and interest payers, as practiced by your party while in power.

Again, same platform says: "Debauched by this great temptation (surplus), the remedy of the Republicans is to meet and exhaust it by extravagant appropriation. The Democratic remedy is to enforce frugality in public expenditures, and abolish unnecessary taxation." Here is an accusation without foundation, and in order to say something, it accuses every other party of doing wrong, and they are alone honest. The party skinned the truth pretty fine on this point with "exacting scrutiny." The Democratic remedy may be "frugality in public expenditures," and we hate to accuse and prove them guilty of violation of every quotation, but, as they welcome "exacting scrutiny," let them face the "critical period." They say they paid out more for pensions than the Republicans during *the* same length of time. They paid more premiums on bonds; they increased the clerical force; they established an Inter-State Commerce Committee; they say they built a powerful navy and established a gun factory; they extended sessions of Congress, which continued wages of those engaged about the halls; they followed the rule of appropriating for internal improvement; Cleveland sent Manton Marble to Europe to adjust silver ratio, etc. This Inter-State Commerce Committee expense the Government pays while they fly around, and then cover a great portion of the reports on safety appliances; and the party does such other things as will conform to "justice and equity," and reduce the "surplus" and make a slight reduc-

tion of unnecessary taxation. The party could not get it down to necessary taxation, because the "advantages awarded our home industries" should not be withdrawn, for free trade was "mischievous, irrelevant, and far removed from and consideration of public good."

Again, the same platform says: "Our domestic industries and enterprises *should not and need not* be endangered by a reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation; on the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must permit and encourage every branch of such industry and enterprise by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operation. In the interest of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic party, and to promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of the necessities of life in the home of every workingman, and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment."

The above is evidently clear-cut and unqualifiedly for protection. They *need not*, and, above all, should *not*, be endangered by a reduction of taxation; as much as to say, if the reduction does endanger them, it should be raised, whether the amount be burdensome or not, for, by so doing, a due "allowance" is had for the difference between "wages of American and foreign labor," and to give the "industries and enterprises" an "extended market" and continuous operation by simply putting "wool" on the free list, in order that the "materials of manufacture" will be cheaper, and, in proportion to the American labor, "the cheapest labor in the world," and reducing the "unnecessary taxation $4\frac{6}{10}$ per cent., to prevent "a demoralizing surplus." So the "established industry" will *not and should not* be deprived of the "benefits we award them," and, "by the slight reduction" "contemplated by the Democratic party," and cheapen the "necessaries of life in the home of every workingman." This is very nice to say, but how about the farms—hogs, cattle, wheat, oats, corn, rye, wool and "free wool," tobacco, cotton, rice, etc., going down, down, when they are now far below living prices? But you think they

can, at lower prices, pay the mortgages, taxes, rates on watered stock, and interest on the same, with enormous dividends of railroad stock; support the National Banks, pay interest on their bonds (and circulation, too), and interest on the "endless bonds" (your Democratic party proposes to issue), and school the bankers' children, pay the expenses of fighting the redskins, pay irrigation rates, pay for champagne, whisky, cigars and other debauching elements used by Congressional committees, and support the pauper element of the priest-ridden hordes of Europe and the idol god worshippers of the old world, who pour in on our country where capital is "discouraged with doubt," and the country "unexampled for progress and renown," under the enforcement of the benign influence of the Republicans' protection policy. If it is not, why admit it in your party platform, and pay for and support the powerful "navy" your party platform says it instituted. This was no doubt overlooked when "the expenditures were frugal and economical." And I suppose the taxpayers should have paid for the embossed copy of the constitution President Cleveland sent to the Pope of Rome, prior to the election, no doubt for the purpose of soliciting foreign influence to aid in his re-election, which he said was wrong. Contrast this with "Jefferson Democracy" about having no foreign political connection (heretofore quoted).

If the laborers are encouraged, what is the use of trying to do so much for them as you promise in the above quotation? It seems as if it is "discouraged capital's" interest that should be considered in conjunction with revision of the tax laws. "Contemplated by the Democracy" the poor capitalists should be protected in order that they may not be bound down to poverty and low wages, destitution and homeless, and pay all the taxes of "undisturbed encouraged labor," while the laborers are spending their time in idleness around the summer watering places and thumping the Chickering amid the palace, while the "discouraged capital" lives out a miserable existence in hovels and filthy tenement houses. If the country is enjoying "unexampled progress and renown" as the result of the degree of "justice and equity" of the law, then it seems any more tinkering with it might prove disastrous to the "discouraged capital," and the laborers cease to make the country "unex-

amplified for progress and renown," why not let well enough alone?

You admit everything the Republicans claim for their protection policy, "unexampled progress and renown." Yet you assume to want to strike it down—the very thing that you admit has contributed to its "unexampled progress and renown." Yet your party is justifiable according to the Democratic rule of "equity and justice," of wishing to do something to pacify "discouraged capital" and protect them from the rapacious, avaricious and domineering spirit of "undisturbed labor." You evidently should cheapen the "necessaries of life" in the home of "disturbed capital," and secure for it "steady and remunerative employment," and "promote the advantages of the discouraged capital" by a fair and careful revision of the tax laws," under which "tax laws" you want to revise, "undisturbed labor" has, you admit, put the country upon a degree of unexampled prosperity, "progress and renown."

But as Mr. Mills, who is a Democrat and the leader in tax reform, says (in his speech heretofore referred to): "But on correct principles of taxation there ought to be a higher duty on sugar than on any other article on the dutiable list."

If the Democratic theory is correct about the cost of an article being increased by the amount of tariff duty, why not follow the "correct principles" of taxation and increase the duty on sugar and thereby follow your platform promise and "cheapen the necessaries of life in the house of every workingman?"

The trouble evidently is that your party wants to protect the Democratic sugar industries and suppress the Republican wool producers' industries. But we find that the "established industries" using cotton, the Democratic States' production, are only disturbed in the "tariff protection" by only ninety-two hundredths of one per cent., evidently because they, the cotton goods manufacturers, were consumers of the raw cotton produced in the Democratic States, and evidently to appease for this inconsistency they give the woolen manufacturer five dollars more protection and put wool on the free list to put down prices of wool produced by Republican States.

And it necessarily follows that the Democratic party can only tell that the tariff is too high by the accumulation of the

"demoralizing surplus" of sixty millions annually, and this is the only item they attempt to judge by, and they hypocritically claim to be for a tariff for "revenue only," when they are unqualifiedly for "protection;" and yet they can only define their tariff position by dollars and cents and not by any settled principle of good government, and if the revenues of the government were producing a deficit of sixty millions of dollars, then for revenue only you would raise the duties sixty millions of dollars and thereby contribute a greater protection than they have now. So your party's theory of adjusting the tariff duties to cure the ills of a country "unexampled for progress and renown" is simply dependent upon the amount needed, and if the amount needed was equal to one-half, two-thirds or all of the money in circulation, you would take it all for a "tariff for revenue only," and not issue or increase the money circulation, that absolutely controls prices, and very correctly, *for if there was no money there would be no money prices.* We see by your platform of 1888 you do not profess to be for a "tariff for revenue only." Such words cannot be found in the platform of 1888.

The report accompanying H. R. Bill, 9051, commonly known as the Mills' Bill, virtually says that the President has discovered what protection—no, that a surplus is accumulating, and that it is caused by "excess of receipts" over expenditures. The President did not say the protection policy was wrong and must be stopped, whether the receipts exceeded expenditures or not, but supposed the tariff was too high, yet he does not say. Thereupon the committee said the surplus was caused by excessive and unjust rates of taxation. Well, the surplus could easily be seen, and an idiot could assign the main cause, when only one main one existed to assign. So the principle of legislation is only defined by dollars and cents. Now, in accordance with their pretensions, the Democrats should have said: "Let us destroy this protective robber policy; it is detrimental to all, because it increases the cost of living and absorbs the profits of the laborers." But no; the party was not elected on that principle, and the cry of "tariff for expenditures, economically applied," is the catchpenny the party uses for bait to betray the undisturbed labor and grant special favors

to discouraged capital. The poor and ignorant are thus hoodwinked into the belief that the party is honest and will carry out its pretensions, when the party has no principles, but dextrously evades living issues, and bids for the support of "discouraged capital" and the Pope of Rome's influence, so as to carry the election, then legislate for the purpose of satisfying the demands of the money power, so it can have "steady and remunerative employment," and cheapen the necessaries in the home of every workingman, and at the same time the prices of the necessaries are now far below the cost of production. Why put them any lower, unless the party wants more tenants and tramps than we now have? *Answer.*

The party platform of 1888 says, lastly: "Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic party submits."

The tariff reform is a terrible bugbear. How many trusts, combines and combinations does it foster? They live and exist without tariff, even if the tariff principle does favor them, as Mr. Mills says. But, according to correct principles of taxation, sugar (a necessary of life) ought to be higher than anything else. How does tariff affect railroad rates, bonds, banks, watered stock, raise prices, pay mortgages, pay taxes, prohibit landlordism, etc.? The party's platforms, records, reports, press speeches and administration, prove conclusively that the party is against each and every principle of justice and equity involved in good government.

In adjusting the tariff duties, the platform says: "Its reduction must be had with reference to the difference in wages between American and foreign labor." Or, the reduction must not be cut low enough to injure the price paid here. Well, if our laborers are better paid than the foreign laborers are, how does the party expect to compete in foreign markets with our goods, and pay transportation charges, too, unless the prices of our raw materials are to go lower than in Europe, and low enough to fill up the difference in wages, and to pay for the freight charges in crossing the ocean, and then the inland railway charges, and then pay the salesman, besides? Our manufacturer cannot compete with the foreign manufacturer in his

home market, unless our home labor and materials are cheaper than Europe's, and then they must be produced lower in order to pay freights and selling expenses; but if labor is higher here than in Europe, then our manufacturers must have a compensating balance in something, and from the position of the Democratic party on "cheap raw material," we are forcibly led to believe that the party desires to use the labor and producers of raw materials of this country as the compensating balance to fill up for the difference in wages of labor and the necessary freight charges.

And if it is right and justice to maintain tariff rates on imported goods in favor of our manufacturers and laborers, the Democratic party violates all rules of justice and equity in trying to put goods free upon their markets and at the same time levy tariff upon the foreign imports. If the foreign manufactured goods will ruin our home manufacturers or tend to curtail their output, it is a solecism to contend that our goods can take the foreign markets away from the manufacturers of foreign countries. Free goods of ours on their markets means free goods of theirs on our markets. Cleveland says this is "irrelevant, mischievous and far removed from any consideration of public good." Blaine says it is the golden rule. Democrats, protectionists, Republicans free trade. But the ungrateful lie is, "That this tariff question concerns every phase of our lives."

Europe has tenant farmers and poor laborers, and America has the same. Our wages and prices concerning "raw materials" must go below those of the foreign raw materials, and in such amount as to be equal to the steamships' freight charges, and then inland charges, and in order to then get a fair patronage our goods must be cheaper than their home productions. If we can do that then foreign labor and capital will seek employment and investment in this country. And so the load is returned in the shape of a ruined market, because the foreign manufacturer shut down and thereby destroyed the market for the English tenant farmer, for he can no longer sell his raw material, as America's is the lowest, or the English manufacturer would not have shut down. The English tenant farmers should exact tribute from us if we do from them, and yet "cheap raw materials" is what the Democratic party emphatically says we

must have. They seem to have as vague an idea of prices and wants of the American laborer and farmers as the simpleton has of the Hindoo race. If supply and demand is unfettered, the amount of money in circulation is the mother of price; and if money determines price then the tariff cannot determine it; and if the money is all withdrawn from circulation money price is destroyed, notwithstanding the tariff remains fixed. No tariff rate can fix an equilibrium of prices between countries if supply and demand is not going to control prices, and if it is not going to, it would be honesty to remove the obstacles of the law of supply and demand. The prices being high or low in any country will be raised or lowered as the money in circulation is increased or decreased; and if the two countries adopt the same money system as the United States and England have done, no tariff, high or low, will save the country from bankruptcy and demoralization. During the period from 1842 up to 1861, we had the Walker free trade tariff (as it was called) of 19 per cent. and in this period the country experienced "hard times" and "good times;" and from 1861 up to 1883 we have had the Morrill tariff, or high tariff of 61 per cent., and times have been hard and good under the high tariff. Neither system is correct or the same would not occur under each. The farmers and laborers have never complained about low or high tariff when money circulated in such a quantity as to insure to labor a profit.

We submit a table taken from A. A. Dunning's *Philosophy of Price*—the dates, amount of money in circulation, and the results:

1811.	\$ 28,000,000	Hard times.
1816.	110,000,000	Good times.
1818.	40,000,000	Panic.
1832.	60,000,000	Fair.
1837.	150,000,000	Booming times.
1843.	58,000,000	Panic.
1847.	105,000,000	Good times.
1857.	215,000,000	Booming times.
1858.	150,000,000	Panic.
1865.	1,651,282,373..	Failures, 530. Booming times.
1873.	738,219,719	5,183. Panic.
1877.	696,413,394	8,872. Prostration.

If the tariff controls prices and guarantees prosperity, why do panics come and go alike with high and low tariff? The answer is that money begets money prices, while tariff is only levied upon price. (This is the general rule.) If those who manipulate the money so choose, they can, by withdrawing the money, destroy a tariff for protection or a tariff for revenue. A sufficient volume of money (say \$60 per capita) will give every willing muscle in our country remunerative and steady employment, and the ability of one to purchase does not depend upon steady employment, as it depends mostly upon the price he receives for his labor.

The producers of raw material must receive such a price for his products as will give such a profit as will enable him to pay such a price for them manufactured as will guarantee a profit to the manufacturer and his day laborers. If they cannot escape with a fair profit, no poor man has a ghost of a show to provide a home for his family and a competency for old age; and if the system does not so adjust itself, you can rely on it that the system is wrong. There is a vacuum between the products of labor that the volume of money must be sufficient to fill up to the profit line, and if the money decreases in circulation, the vacuum becomes smaller and smaller all the while, until the vacuum is closed, and both fall far below the cost of production; and then comes panics, strikes, riots, starvation, idleness, poverty and crime, and general disorder.

There is such a wide difference between price and value that it seems any person of ordinary intelligence would be well versed in the difference, for we find that *values* adjust themselves to man's mental measure, and *prices* adjust themselves to money measure.

It seems from this statement, then, that if a tariff duty is correct in principle, a specific duty would be the only one of steady reliance, for a duty of 10 cents per yard would always mean just that much per yard, and the amount of revenue thus to be raised would only depend upon the number of yards imported; whereas, if it was a duty of 10 per cent. *ad valorem* (on price), the revenue would depend both upon the number of yards and of price, and, as prices fluctuate, 10 per cent. may only raise \$1 revenue on the 1st of July, on a

stated number of yards, while on the 1st of January, on the same amount, the revenue may only raise 75 cents; and the same argument will answer for demonstrating a tariff for protection.

A consistent position for the Democratic party to take for a tariff for "revenue only," then, would be strictly for a specific duty, for by this method the party would exhibit a love for the revenue derived from imports on specific amounts, as yards, bushels, pounds, ounces, etc., and at the same time say they were after a steady revenue on a certain and well-defined theory; but to depend upon an *ad valorem* puts the whole into the mental measure of a board of appraisers. If they raise from 100 yards of cloth, priced at \$150, a revenue of \$22.50 *ad valorem* in 1889, it follows that the same should be raised on the same in 1890. Yet the 100 yards of cloth may be priced at \$100, and the duty thus laid for revenue would only be \$15; whereas, if the duty had been specific at $22\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard, the amount of revenue would have been equal for the two years, and we find, at the *ad valorem* rate of duty, a deficit in the revenue would be $7\frac{1}{2}$, and if the cloth had been subject to both specific and *ad valorem*, the deficit would have occurred all the same. We think a specific duty is the more appropriate way to declare for a tariff for "revenue only," and maintains more consistency. The party is not a unit upon the tariff, for the reason no one can state a good principle governmental policy, based upon dollars and cents, for it can not have a steady application; nor is the party a unit upon any question. The party was overwhelmed with honesty in 1872, when Liberal Republicans made their platform, on which the Democratic party jumped by endorsing both platform and candidate. This was the birth of this bastard party, called Democrats—named Democrat, we suppose, because its mother's name was largely Democratic. The Democratic platform said about the tariff, 1872: * * * "And, recognizing that there are in our midst honest but *irreconcilable differences* of opinion with regard to the respective systems of free trade and protection, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts, and the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation."

The party would have shown more respect for truth in 1888 if they had adopted the above; but the trouble was, it was unqualifiedly for protection.

The party platform of 1876 says: "We demand all custom house taxation shall be only for revenue."

The party platform of 1880 just barely mentions: * * * "And a tariff for revenue only."

The party platform of 1884 says: "The Democratic party is pledged to *revise* the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests, * * * * It is not proposed to injure any domestic industries but rather promote their healthy growth." And the Republican platform of the same year says: "The Republican party is pledged *itself* to correct the inequalities of the tariff and *reduce the surplus* * * * * by such methods as will *relieve* the taxpayers without injuring the laborer."

The Democrats were looking after the manufacturers and the Republicans after the laborers, or pretended to. This was a very close call on the tariff, in revising and correcting. The eastern element went for the Democratic plan of *revision* instead of the Republican's plan of *correcting*.

The Democratic platform of 1888 has been quoted heretofore and it is purely a protectionist document. Not a word can we find about "free trade," "tariff for revenue only," or Blaine's advanced *idea of reciprocity*. The old Democratic war whoop of "Free trade and sailors' rights" has lost its charms. There are now more free traders in the Republican party than in the Democratic party, and for the proof of the assertion, we submit an editorial of the leading Democratic paper of the west, the *St. Louis Republic*, of Feb. 10, 1891, under the caption of "For Revenue Only:" "There are many free traders in the country and their numbers are constantly increasing. Some of them vote with the Democrats, but in the past more of them have voted with the Republicans. It is our observation that there are two Republicans who would vote to abolish the tariff outright where there is one Democrat who would favor such a policy. In the last election, however, very many of these Republican free traders in the west voted with the Democrats. But in so doing they had every opportunity to

know, and there is no doubt they did know, that the Democratic party, although it is opposed to taxation to increase the prices or restrict supply, *is in favor* of a tariff levied for the sole purpose of raising revenue.

“This is the party’s position and this is the position of Senator Vest. *He is no more in favor* of completely abolishing the tariff than he is of so adjusting it, that, in raising revenue needed to support the government, it will become an agency for larceny, direct or indirect, * * *

The above editorial puts the party on the high tariff side of the question, and says the tariff increases the price of the goods, but for sake of revenue the party will raise the price for revenue. If a large amount is wrong in principle, so is a small amount. The principle is overlooked for the sake of revenue, and the principle is overlooked for the sake of protection. If a person steals a horse the Democratic party would justify (by the above) on the principle of revenue only, and the Republicans on the ground of protection; and from the position now of the Democratic party they are as liable to yelp out, “On the grounds of protection; the thief is justified.” And the Republicans to keep up a difference would yelp out, for “revenue and reciprocity.” If a party commits a crime he would escape more easily if the law would let him say what kind of a crime it was and set the punishment.

This is the position of the Democratic party of to-day, and only nineteen years old. It evidently should be sent to a reform school for wanting to raise the prices of the necessities of life (and unnecessaries), and say it is only for revenue, yet wrong in principle. The tariff taxation does not injure the people in any measure like the money power does. It is the climax of robbers. Why don’t the party put in a plank on the money question, and give the people some relief from the blood-sucking grasp of money monopoly, and then give us a graduated income tax upon incomes for “revenue only?” The answer is the party yields gracefully to each and every demand of the money power, to enlist its support for the purpose of getting offices only.

The Democratic party was the tool of the slave power, and the Whigs bid steadfastly and eagerly for the support of the

slave power, and wanted to do its bidding; but the Democratic party was to be trusted on the slavery question, and while the Whigs offered to support the slave power, a large majority of Whigs were highly in favor of the abolition of slavery, but could not force the plank into the platform. The leaders were corrupt, consequently you could not reform slavery in its ranks, and it took a new party to do it, the *Republican*. And the same follows to-day. A majority of the Democratic and Republican voters are in favor of the abolition of money monopoly, but the leaders are not, so it takes a new party to correct the evil now seriously affecting all portions of our country, notwithstanding the old parties say it is "unexampled for progress, prosperity and renown."

We have shown that the Democratic party is without any principles, and will always be, as long as it continues to yelp, "tariff taxation," for the reasons heretofore given.

If the party is so much in favor of the poor laborers, it should repeal all tariff laws on any of the necessities of life, and abandon the tariff for "revenue only," or now for its protection policy, and declare for a graduated income tax for "revenue only." For by this system the tax would be paid by men with large incomes who are more able to pay, and thus release the poor with only scant living incomes, for by this method the poor would no longer be required to pay as much, if not more, tax than the rich, as under the present tariff taxation. The bankers, bondholders, speculators, railroad stock holders and others that have been favored by law, have created the greater portion of the monied obligations of the government; and by adopting the graduated income tax system the above named class would be required to pay the interest and principal of the debts created by and for them; *and on a man's ability to pay should alone rest the theory of taxation, and not upon what he is able to consume.* And it further seems, as the tariff, however small, is protection to the laborers or manufacturers, that better protection to the laborers could be had by taxing incomes. But on this theory the party would throw up all hands and say the poor laborers must pay a tax in proportion to their abilities to consume, in return for the "protection straight," or for the "incidental protection," the tariff system affords

them, which is laid for their benefit. This is their only excuse or answer. *The idea of laying a tariff for revenue, incidental or for actual protection, and then on the other hand take it away for taxes to support the Government, and release the rich from a true and equitable system of taxation, is more than the author or any other average voter can comprehend.*

A belief is now prevalent that it will take a new party and new men to right the evils that pervade every portion of our country. This is based upon the fact that those who manipulate nominations and dictate platforms "have no politics but plunder, and no object in life but the spoliation of the human race."

The perpetuity of our republican institutions is enveloped in danger of the greatest magnitude, owing to the unjust and class legal enactments pertaining to money, land, transportation, public communications, taxation, option, or dealing in futures, trusts, and the liquor traffic.

The questions above stated have been ably discussed by many eminent writers, but we will briefly notice some of them.

This money question is the greatest and of far more importance, because it is the agency of civilization, and without it civilization would die. Money is the evidence of organized society—a creature of law. Its only value is only determined by exchange for those things which meet man's wants, needs and desires. It will not clothe, feed, warm, cure, or contribute to his happiness until it is parted with, and its highest function, debt-paying power, exists only by fiat of law. *Labor only creates REAL value, and not law.*

The fight is not so much on the kind as on quantity. Every one admits that the gold and silver are not plentiful to supply the needs of the people, and to supply the want, resort is had to paper, the favorite money of the working classes. Bank notes are the favorite of the capitalists. Shall it be the banker's promissory notes or the people's legal tender paper dollars, issued by the government in sufficient volume to move every muscle? Bank notes get into circulation only on loans, and they are always stained with interest. You can protest the notes if not redeemed on demand, in the people's greenback dollar now in circulation; the bank note can be sued on just like the reader's note. The banker's prosperity rests upon the

debts of the people. Give us a volume of our own money, that, by industry and economy, in a few years we will have more loaners than borrowers. Under this system nearly all are borrowers and few loaners. Under this system the competition is thrown between two laborers after one dollar. The laborer that will give the most time for the dollar gets employment at starvation wages and the other laborer goes tramping.

Under a correct system of money (as briefly mentioned) the competition will be thrown between two dollars after one laborer, and the dollar that will cover the least amount of time finds exchange, and the laborer gets good wages, while the other dollar does the tramping instead of the laborer, as now. Which is the more preferable, tramp laborers or tramping dollars? The argument applies to products of labor as well. Tramping laborers are sure signs of hard times and destitution amid plenty. Tramping dollars indicates that every person is employed—happiness and prosperity reigns supreme. What is the sense of having bank notes? If this prerogative can be used by one it can be used by all. Promissory notes (bank notes) are issued upon the hypothecation of bonds. Why not let farmers hypothecate lands and issue their promissory notes to circulate as money and let the government play redeemer until we choose to close? If the people's legal tender paper dollars have to play redeemer for National Bank note circulation, let the government suppress the bankers' circulation and put in the people's paper circulation, *an absolute paper dollar*. The bankers are making too much money off of the scheme; if they were not they would not follow banking.

Then the banking system and the specie-basis system must go, and that in a hurry. Such injustice and refined robbery has no friends this side of Satan's headquarters.

We have proved that the Democratic party is in favor of National Banks, and we will submit additional evidence that the party is not in favor of the absolute paper dollar, but is in favor of a specie basis. This system means one money for the capitalists and another for the laborers; or in other words, *the capitalists can pay labor in the money based upon specie, yet the laborers cannot in turn pay them with the same money.*

The bastard Democratic platform of 1872 says, in the eighth plank: "A speedy return to specie payment is demanded alike by the highest consideration of commercial morality and honest government."

The platform of 1876 says: "Reform is necessary to establish a sound currency, restore public credit and maintain national honor. We denounce the failure, for all these eleven years of peace, to make good the promise of the legal tender notes, which are a changing standard of value in the hands of the people, and the non-payment of which is a disregard of the plighted faith of the Nation. * * * * We denounce the financial imbecility of that party which, during eleven years of peace, has made no advance toward resumption, no preparation for resumption, but, instead, has obstructed resumption by wasting our resources and exhausting all our surplus income, and, while annually professing to intend a SPEEDY return to specie payments, has annually enacted fresh hindrances thereto. As such hindrance, we denounce the resumption clause of 1875, and we demand its repeal."

The party platform of 1880 says: "Home rule, honest money, consisting of gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin on demand; the strict maintenance of the public faith."

Senator Bayard, a leading Democrat, said in his speech in New York City, 1880: "I am now for resumption, and the Democratic candidates for President and Vice-President want the same kind of resumption that I do — a real, and not a sham resumption. We want the resumption intended to be secured by the resolution I offered in the Senate last December. * * * It was a resolution right on the ancient pathway of Constitutional Democracy, withdrawing from the treasury notes, when paid and redeemed at the Treasury, *any* power of enforced legal tender when re-issued. * * * There is great danger to us, and our posterity is and will be in *great jeopardy* so long as the legal tender credit currency is in existence."

The party platforms of 1884 and 1888 say nothing, as the time passed and resumption robbery went on, and the Government resumed specie payment by issuing bonds payable in coin and interest also; and for the party's last declaration concerning legal tender paper money, see quotation heretofore given from

the Secretary's report of 1888, the plan for retiring the \$346,000,000 of greenbacks that were not converted into bonds by the wholesale howl of the people, which caused the above amount to remain in circulation; and since Sherman's edict to receive them in payment for dues at the custom houses, they have been on a par with gold, all that an absolute paper can do; and it is doing now (although it will not pay interest on the public debt or principal) just what the gold-bugs, speculators and the old parties say it cannot do. The greenback dollar, in its crippled condition, stands up and calls and proves them liars.

From the quotations and speeches, the Democratic party is in favor of National Bank notes, and not in favor of an absolute legal tender paper dollar. It is admitted by all that metal money is not sufficient in quantity, and that we must have a paper currency. The question turns upon who shall issue and control it—the bankers or the people? The Democratic and Republican parties say bankers; Alliance says people, and in so doing, the Alliance quotes Democratic doctrine for its position. That party's platform of 1876 says: "Reform can only be had by a peaceful civil revolution. We demand a change of system, a change of administration, a change of parties, that they may have a change of measures and of men."

The record discloses some wonderful things. Land monopoly is wrong. If any person owns and controls more land than he can cultivate of his own and reasonable hired help; if his holdings exceed this, he can, with the same propriety, own it by townships, counties and States, and the whole United States, if he can buy it. The amount he should be allowed to own depends much upon population and acres. Landlordism and tenantry is a sure index of the usurpation of the natural rights of mankind, in prohibiting him from using a portion of the earth for his sole use and benefit, and not partly for landlords and part for himself. Large landed estates of this country must eventually give way to laws of descent, by reason of the prohibition of the rights of primogeniture and entailed estates. The Constitutional framers were on the lookout, and they thought by the above prohibition (indirectly) and the prohibition of granting any titles of nobility, they would prevent a royal caste of society here. But they evidently overlooked that the creation

of artificial persons (corporations) would create this caste, by reason of incomes. Land at one time was the chief basis of royalty, when by means of legislative enactments creating bonded debts, at the same time payable in coin so that the payment could not be made in a reasonable time, investments in the same became more preferable than land. And as royalty never meant anything only a division of society, rich and poor, and royalty lived off of stated incomes and annuities paid from the public revenues.

A royal cast of society is created in the pension system by giving to the Generals and their widows large annuities and to the privates and their widows small and insignificant amounts. This is the distinction shown in the military department. The other royal caste is in the civil department of society; is between the bankers, bondholders and landlords. Monied persons on one side and the poor laborers and tenants on the other. The poor pay all for the aristocrats. While we have no titles of nobility, the results in incomes and annuities have obtained a place in our government which they prefer to empty titles. These are English customs, and so is the landlord and tenant system; and as a result of this infamous and robbing money system, land is fast passing into a few hands known in law as a corporation composed of American and foreign capital. These kind of artificial persons never die and know no division of land, and is farmed by tenants managed by a board of directors. Then by this method entailed estates, so far as non-division is concerned, exists in our country. Many foreign natural persons own thousands of acres of American soil, but owe no allegiance to our government. If they are not a party to our compact of government, no right exists to compel us to defend such holdings, and if no right exists to compel us to defend such holdings no right exists in the law to confer on him any title to the land. And by virtue of the money system the land has been passing into the hands of the few, because the land owners are compelled to mortgage their land for the purpose of keeping money in circulation with which to exchange these products, and as a result of the mortgage system we have as many if not more tenants than many of the older countries of Europe.

The scheme for government loans on land is presented as a solution for the condition that now exists. It may be called a species of class legislation, and perhaps is to some extent; but for sake of argument we will admit that it is absolutely so. Well, each and every one deplores the condition of the farmers, and their condition is the result of uncalled for and wicked species of class legislation on the control of money, and, as class legislation put them where they are to-day. If they are ever to get out it is the only thing that will do it. They must go out through the same loophole they came, and by this scheme the interest goes to pay taxes instead of paying interest and taxes as now.

Agriculture is the basis of society or government, and if the basis falls, down goes the whole structure, and the permanency of the structure depends solely upon a sound basis, so as land and farmers bear the structure of society they must have the best possible support or they will fail to support the human family and enjoy life, and if they are prosperous so are all other industrious classes, but it does not follow when other classes are prosperous that the farmers are. So special benefits must go to them.

And on this loan scheme the farmers are not asking any more than the Government is already doing. The banker deposits his bond, and the Government strikes blackback for the banker to loan and speculate on off of the farmer. If this is right, so is loaning money on land or other like security; the only difference is, the land is the best security. The Government lays an internal revenue tax upon liquors, and for the sole benefit of the distillers the Government consents for the liquors to be put in warehouses, in order to give "age" to it, we suppose, for the purpose of stopping the selling of bad or raw whisky (no one ever saw any good, and perhaps this was the Democratic "raw material" that it wanted cheapened). The distiller puts his whiskies in the warehouse as a bond for paying the internal tax, and when the distiller finds sale for it, the tax is then paid out of the proceeds of the whisky; but if exported, they pay nothing. When the barrel is stamped and gauged, the tax (say \$40 per barrel) is due; but in order to give accommodation to the distiller, the Government says: "You can pay

the \$40 when you sell it, and you can have the use of the money that is due on the barrel." The whisky is considered good security, as it is a staple article in election campaigns. If the above theory is not correct there would be no use of bonded warehouses. The farmers offer to pay interest but the distiller does not. The Government encourages the manufacture of a stuff to demoralize society, but refuses to give encouragement to the things that build and uphold it; and to show what abuses grow out of the liquor system, we submit a letter which appears in the *St. Louis Republic*, Oct. 19, 1890. The paper says it was written by a justice of the peace at Wardensville, W. Va., Oct. 14; it says: "I have seen Mr. Chas. Zepp's distillery record and ascertain therefrom that the last whisky taken out of bond at his distillery was on the 5th of June, 1890, which was all the whisky he had in bond except one barrel of forty-five gallons. That barrel was kept in the bonded warehouse, with Mr. U. S. Davis as storekeeper and gauger, watching it until the 30th day of September, 1890, a period of just one hundred days at \$2 per day. A 'right soft snap,' I would call it. There is no mistake as to the facts of this statement. I took it directly from Mr. Zepp's books myself."

The above letter indicates how much respect the old parties have for equity, justice or honesty. A barrel of whisky bonded for \$40.50 as revenue, and then hire a man at \$2 per day to watch forty-five gallons of the stuff not fit for beasts, much less for man, and spend at least \$200.00 trying to get \$40.50. The above system is upheld and fostered by both parties. Yet they say, to loan money to farmers on land, cotton, etc., is unconstitutional. Where is the constitutional power to do the other?

This Government is going to, or has loaned millions of dollars to Nicaragua State, of Central America, and takes a lien upon the Nicaragua Canal. Is this *internal improvement*? By what constitutional power is this authorized? Why not loan money to farmers? If not, why?

Commerce is an outgrowth of organized society, and its attributes are money, transportation and public communication. Money to change ownership, transportation to change products of labor from place to place, public communication expressing conditions, agreements, notices concerning the same, and social

correspondence. Governments (the people), by reason of organizing as such, created commerce, and on a strict control of it and of each and every attribute of it depends the *general welfare* of the people. If the welfare of the people depends as before stated, then a delegation of the power to corporations to control any and all of the attributes of commerce is to put in them the power to decide how much or how little prosperity the people shall have. If the welfare of the people did not depend upon the system of transportation, corporations would not ask for its control to be delegated to them. And by reason of the people being compelled to patronize the railroads, the reason is found why corporations want to control it. If the people were not of a necessity compelled to use it, the incorporators would not want to invest in the transportation lines. And if it is a necessity created by the people, the reason is discovered why they ought to control it. The law, by virtue of its provisions, invites men to invest capital in banks (money), corporations, as railroads (transportation), telegraphs and telephones (public communication), and then undertakes to dictate to vested rights in what manner he shall control his investment, or in other words, tells him how he must conduct his business. Why? Because the law has delegated to him the prosperity of the people, and the law says if we do not control his vested rights he will charge as much rate as he pleases, and take all of the products of labor for freight, interest, toll charge, and soon own the whole country. The trouble is that the law has delegated the wrong power. If not, why control vested rights?

If the delegation of the power to control money, transportation, telegraphs and telephones to corporations, is constitutional, so is the entire postal system, so is the war power, and so is the legislative, judicial and executive powers, and so is the powers over treaties. If all these powers (creatures of governments) are delegated, where would we find ourselves? We are in a distressing condition over the delegation of the first three, much less the delegation of all. By the first trio, distribution is performed on a robbing scale, and by the last, liberty would be entirely surrendered. To control vested rights in one kind of property means to control them in all others. Vested rights in anything that must be controlled by law to protect society is

vested in the wrong place. If society must be protected by law from the corporations controlling the banks, railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, by reason of the individuals conducting the business necessarily given them in their articles of incorporation, and supervising the vested rights, then we find that it is fundamentally wrong to create and delegate the things that will rob and abuse society, without legal interference. We are led to believe that, for the above reasons, there is no express power in the Constitution for creating a corporation; yet they escape through the channels of incidental powers, on the same "incidental," or *means to an end* for carrying into effect the granted powers of the Constitution. The war or treaty powers can be delegated to corporations.

The above argument is sustained by the law of eminent domain. This is taking private property for *public use*, and not *private use*, or for the investment of vested rights. If the land be taken for public use, it does not mean for individual benefit, for the policy is wrong; and principles of law that destroy one's vested rights in property (land), and delivers them over to another under the plea it is for public use, is without equity, and is purely a violation of fundamental law. The Constitution confers on Congress the power of carrying into effect each and every specific or incidental provision of the Constitution. It may adopt means to an end for them, but such means must be absolutely within the government, and not a delegation of the means. Under the system, law will require individuals to come into courts, or committee rooms and explain the methods, the amount of capital, the rates, watered stocks, dividends, and all about his private property, under the plea that it is public property or public means. The owner of the land, who was compelled to sell his home or a portion of his land to a railroad company for right of way, discovers that the land he formerly owned is used by other individuals for profit, and that the public has no rights in the land whatever. The idea of this kind of property being subject to taxation, and yet is public property, is simply preposterous.

To have correct distribution of the products of labor, the money and lines of transportation must be absolutely controlled by the Government, asserting its prerogative of eminent domain

for public use (not private), giving a just compensation therefor. The objection raised to this is the cry of throwing so much official patronage to the dominant party. The corporations desire that party supremacy that will give them aid and favors, and they have men to look to the business of elections and candidates. Why? In order that their vested rights may be protected and favored. Under the Government system, the main incentive to control legislation is destroyed—vested rights. No candidates or elections will be looked after for this purpose. Self-interest incites many men. Another argument against it is that it is a centralizing power, and, by reason of that, the laborers will be coerced into voting against all policies of good government; or, rather, for the party that gives them employment. This is not well founded, from the fact that the greater portion of them are not so used, or will not be; and if they could be used by men to vote any way, the time would be now.

There is a vast difference in the centralization of power and the centralization of wealth. There is a certain mode laid down for officers to follow, and if they do not, then, perhaps, at the next election they are defeated. Centralized power is the weapon of the absolute dictator, under some forms of government; but here no one is supreme, and the people decide at certain times whether the limited powers conferred upon any official has been duly observed. The kind of centralized power we have here amounts to nothing; but centralized wealth is the mischief in our Government. A strong centralized government is based upon wealth, being concentrated into few hands, and the chief magistrate is the absolute dictator of law. The people surely ought to be able to control and supervise the very things that are necessary for their existence. If they cannot, a republican form of government is a failure, and corporations are the only things that seem to have ability enough to do what some say society cannot do.

But the old political parties have laid the foundation for controlling vested rights in railroads, so we suppose they will not be condemned for going far enough to absolutely dictate the management of all the lines of transportation. Under a government system of operating railroads, freight charges need only be great enough to pay operating expenses. We further notice

that a company frequently goes into a receiver's hands, appointed by the Government, under whose management the road seldom fails to pay from the start.

The record of the Democratic party platforms, messages, speeches, reports and press, are strictly opposed to each and every, and severally, of all the principles laid down in the demands of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union.

The principles of the party can only be found in its platforms, congressional speeches and records, and not in the rank and file of the party; and the person who makes the assertion that the principles of the two are alike, is either a simpleton or a dangerous voter.

The dealing in futures or options is a species of fraud. The men who follow it are selling something they have not, never had, never expect to have, and do not want. Why? Because they can make just as much money off *cotton and wheat that has never been raised* as the farmers can off that which they do raise. This is absolute swindling. It controls prices, or nearly so, by putting, say, four hundred million bushels never raised, against four hundred million bushels that the farmer raises. So the supply is doubled on the market, against a given number of dollars, and, as a result, prices shrink one-half, and dealers in options steal one-half of what the farmers' sweat and hard toil produces. The Louisiana Lottery was virtually suppressed because it was a species of gambling off of labor for future proceeds; and for the same reason dealing in options should be suppressed, to-wit: "dealing for future proceeds." The option is many times more derogatory, and absolutely life-destroying, than the lottery. Why not suppress both? The reason is, that it is not the kind of *natural* competition the Democratic party wanted, but is just what the party is for.

The party is in favor: Of National Banks issuing and controlling the paper currency; in favor of the robbing specie-basis system; in favor of issuing endless bonds to retire over three hundred and forty-six millions of legal tender; in favor of exempting the bonds for taxation; in favor of issuing 10 per cent. more bank notes on the bonds; in favor of making the bank notes a legal tender; in favor of the suspension of the silver dollar, and says it is only worth 79 cents (record is the pri-

mary evidence, and the best); in favor of the corporations controlling each and every avenue of commerce; in favor of option dealing; in favor of a small amount of circulating medium; it is not in favor of land loans, but is in favor of whisky loans; it is not in favor of a graduated income tax; in favor of a protective tariff (if it has any position on it); in favor of granting special privileges to the money power, by depositing public money in banks as fixed balances; in favor of paying premiums on bonds to get to buy them (and no positive sanction of law to pay it out for that purpose); and in favor of anything that the corporations, money power and protected industries want, in order to have their support in campaigns. We submit the demands of the Alliance, to show what it demands and are opposed in each by the old parties. The Ocala national meeting adopted the following resolution unanimously (by Tennessee explaining its three votes):

1. Resolved, That this National Convention of the Farmers Alliance and Industrial Union do hereby most earnestly and emphatically endorse the St. Louis platform adopted last December, and with equal sincerity and persistency demand that all subordinate bodies connected with this organization shall not only align themselves therewith, but co-operate with this national organization and sustain the same.

1a. We demand the abolition of National Banks.

b. We demand that the government shall establish sub-treasuries or depositories in the several States, which shall loan money direct to the people at a low rate of interest, not to exceed two per cent. per annum, on non-perishable farm products, and also upon real estate, with proper limitations upon the quantity of land and amount of money.

c. We demand that the amount of the circulating medium be speedily increased to not less than \$50 per capita.

2. That we demand that Congress shall pass such laws as will effectually prevent the dealing in futures of all agricultural and mechanical productions; providing a stringent system of procedure in trials that will secure the prompt conviction, and imposing such penalties as shall secure the most perfect compliance with the law.

Adopted.

3. We condemn the silver bill recently passed by Congress, and demand in lieu thereof the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Adopted.

4. We demand the passage of laws prohibiting alien ownership of land, and that Congress take prompt action to devise some plan to obtain all lands now owned by aliens and foreign syndicates; and that all lands now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of such as is act-

ually used and needed by them be reclaimed by the Government, and held by actual settlers only.

Adopted.

5. Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, we demand—

a. That our national legislation shall be so framed in the future as not to build up one industry at the expense of another.

b. We further demand a removal of the existing heavy tariff tax from the necessities of life, that the poor of our land must have.

c. We further demand a just and equitable system of graduated tax on incomes.

d. We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all national and State revenues shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the Government economically and honestly administered.

Adopted.

6. We demand the most rigid, honest and just State and national governmental control and supervision of the means of public communication and transportation, and if this control and supervision does not remove the abuse now existing, we demand the government ownership of such means of communication and transportation.

7. We demand that the Congress of the United States submit an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people of each State.

Adopted.

Moved, by Brother Livingston, that the report be adopted as a whole.

Carried.

We were requested in Mr. Hambaugh's second letter written to the author, to point out the difference between the demands of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union and the Democratic party. We think we have done it, and more, by showing that the Democratic party of to-day has no defined principles of governmental policy in its platform, *only protection to the manufacturing industries*; and that the Democratic and Republican parties are alike, and opposed to all of the demands of the Alliance. All quotations from platforms are from National Platforms adopted in National Convention.

Individuals cannot be forced to reform, and individuals lead political parties, dictate platforms, manipulate conventions and nominations; and if the leaders of a political party are corrupt, the political party cannot reform. It takes a new party to correct these evils, and I am going with it.

THE MONITOR,

A WEEKLY PAPER

PUBLISHED BY THE MONITOR PUBLISHING COMPANY,

DEVOTED TO THE INTEREST OF THE

LABORING CLASSES, FARMERS' ALLIANCE AND INDUSTRIAL UNION.

ITS COLUMNS EACH ISSUE GLEAM WITH
INTELLIGENT ARTICLES UPON THE *DEMANDS* OF THE ORDER
AND GENERAL NEWS.

THE • LABORERS' • "FRIEND" • AND • "SENTINEL."

Every Voter in the Land Should Read It.

SAMPLE COPIES FREE.

TERMS: FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

Address,

THE MONITOR,

ROOM 506, FAGIN BUILDING,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 788 083 0

permalife®
pH 8.5